

BX 8249

.B2 N3







A

NARRATIVE AND DEFENCE

OF THE
PROCEEDINGS OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH
IN
BALTIMORE CITY STATION,
AGAINST
CERTAIN LOCAL PREACHERS AND LAY-MEMBERS
OF SAID CHURCH,
BY THE
PERSONS WHO PREFERRED AND SUSTAINED THE CHARGES.

TO WHICH IS ADDED

An Appendix,

CONTAINING THE

REV. JAMES M. HANSON'S VINDICATION
OF HIS OFFICIAL CONDUCT IN RELATION TO THE ABOVE PROCEEDINGS:

TOGETHER WITH OTHER INTERESTING DOCUMENTS.

Put them in mind—to speak evil of no man. *Titus* iii. 1—2.

Speak not evil one of another, brethren. *James* iv. 11.

Wherefore, laying aside all malice, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and all evil-speaking, &c. 1 *Peter* ii. 1.

For individuals to do wrong in their social or church capacity, is a GREATER CRIME than to do wrong in their individual capacity; because their official acts will be more extensive in their influence, and of course the injury will be greater. *Asa Shinn, M. R. vol. iii. p. 12.*

Baltimore:

PUBLISHED BY ARMSTRONG & PLASKITT.

J. D. TOY, PRINTER.

1828.



BX8249
B2N3

INTRODUCTION.

Soon after the proceedings detailed in the following pages, had commenced, "Dr. Jennings' Protest and Argument" was announced in the "American," a daily newspaper of this city, as follows:

"Just published, Dr. Samuel K. Jennings' Protest and Argument against the proceedings of his prosecutors in the Baltimore City Station, who have combined to prefer charges against him and others, which charges when analyzed, assert that local preachers and lay-members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, have no right to become members of the 'Union Society,' nor to publish the 'Mutual Rights.'

Nec spes libertatis erat, nec cura peculi.

October 1, 1827."

This was certainly a novel procedure. The committee before whom he had appeared and made his protest and argument, had not decided upon his case. And from the nature, number and length of the passages in the "Mutual Rights" referred to, in the charges which had been exhibited against him, it was obvious that a speedy decision was not to be expected. To appeal to the public before the decision was had, was an open insult to the judicatory constituted under the discipline to try the case, and to the church which had authorised and required the measure. The protest itself, showed an evident design to enlist public feeling in his favour, and thus to intimidate the church authorities, and to forestall the opinion of the Methodists, by making an erroneous impression as to the nature of the prosecution. It was the obvious policy of this and the numerous protests and other publications which soon followed, to induce the community to believe the members of the Baltimore Union Society were persecuted for their opinions—that an attempt was making to deprive them of the liberty of speech and of the press; and that the allegations against them, would apply with equal force to reformers elsewhere. The reader will find in the following pages, that nothing of this kind was done or intended to be done by the church. That it was not the *liberty* of speech or of the press, but their *licentiousness*, that the church designed to curb or to punish. But weighty considerations forbade any other measure, calculated to counteract the efforts which were so insiduously making to impose upon the community, except that of soliciting a suspension of public opinion on the subject, until it would be proper to place the whole matter fairly before them. The members of the church who had

preferred the charges, therefore published the following request, immediately under the advertisement of the Doctor's Protest, &c. To wit:

"Doctor Samuel K. Jennings having endeavoured to forestall the opinion of the Methodist public, by publishing the proceedings in his case, before the decision of the Committee could be known—all who feel any concern in the matter, are respectfully requested to suspend their judgment, until the proceedings shall have terminated, when a plain statement of the whole affair will be published.

GEORGE EARNEST,
JACOB ROGERS,
ISAAC N. TOY,
SAMUEL HARDEN,
ALEXANDER YEARLEY,
JOHN BERRY,
FIELDER ISRAEL."

October 3, 1827.

This was immediately followed by the following rejoinder by the Doctor.

"Dr. Samuel K. Jennings has not 'endeavoured to forestall the opinion of the Methodist public, by publishing the proceedings in his case, before the decision of the committee could be known.' The decision of the committee, was of no importance to him. He considered the case, as not coming within the jurisdiction of the preacher in charge, and accordingly protested against the competency of the tribunal, before which he was summoned to appear.—He knew, that the jury, that is, the committee, partook in the appointment of his seven accusers, and therefore protested against them as having prejudged his case. He viewed the prosecutions which have been set on foot in this city, as the harbingers of a general persecution of the friends of religious liberty, in the Methodist Episcopal Church throughout the United States, and therefore conceived it to be his imperious duty to publish his protest against such unrighteous doings, for the information of reformers at a distance.

"The pretensions of these seven men and their coadjutors as censors of the press, if sustained, are sufficient to alarm the whole community. Dr Jennings is not accused of any immorality, and yet he is prosecuted with the avowed intention to excommunicate him, because he, with others, has used the press, in pointing out the despotic character of the government of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and investigating the executive conduct of her travelling Ministers, who have taken upon themselves, the entire government of the church, to the exclusion of the Local Ministers and the whole body of the people. When a plain statement of the whole affair shall have been given to the public, and the entire plan of this persecution shall have been developed, the disinterested part of the community, will understand more fully, the propriety of the course which Dr. Jennings has taken.

October 4, 1827."

A plain statement of the whole affair is now before the public, and whether "the disinterested part of the community will now see more fully, the propriety of the course which Dr. Jennings and his associates" have taken, is not for us to say. Our readers will no doubt claim the privilege of deciding for themselves. All we ask is a patient and impartial hearing.

STATEMENT.

THE undersigned, members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Baltimore city station, who in obedience to a high sense of duty to God, and to the church, have presented and sustained charges of improper conduct, against certain local preachers and lay-members, within the said station; think a due respect for the opinion of their brethren, here and elsewhere, requires of them a fair and candid statement of the whole procedure; together with the reasons which impelled them to so important a measure.

From the time that they announced this intention and requested a suspension of opinion until it should be proper to fulfil it,* they have been urged by many of their friends to hasten the publication, without awaiting the decision of the church judicatories, before whom the cases were to be tried, or to whom an appeal would lie, if the decision should be adverse to the accused. It was alleged in support of this measure that some of those who had been cited to trial, had published their protests and defences, not only to the church but to the world; and therefore had no claim to the delicacy which would otherwise forbid any measure, tending to prejudice their cases before the tribunals who had an appellent jurisdiction in the premises. But we were restrained by the consideration, that the irregular conduct of a part, ought not to be attributed to the whole; and we could not in our publication avoid the application of our remarks to all the accused. Late measures of the Union Society, in which we believe there was a common participation, might have released us from all restraint. At a meeting, called for the purpose,† they have passed a set of resolutions, not only justificatory of themselves, but

* See the Introduction.

† In the proceedings of this meeting, as published, there is an artful endeavour to make the public believe that the meeting was composed of methodists, *not* members of the Union Society. But if we except the females who composed a considerable proportion of the assembly, and the males who were not members of the church at all, together with those friends of the church author-

condemning and defaming the pastor of the church and all who participated in the proceedings against them. Before these proceedings had resulted in any decision whatever, they have not only constituted themselves judges in their own case, but have by summary process, tried and condemned the constituted authorities of the church, without permitting them even to say a word in their own defence. But notwithstanding we were fully aware of the erroneous impressions which the statements, so prematurely and improperly published were calculated to make, we have deemed it our duty to avoid any thing which might have the least effect, in prejudicing the cause of the accused with the church judicatories to whom they might appeal. The whole proceedings having terminated, we hasten to redeem the pledge heretofore given, namely, to give, as soon as it should be proper to do so, a fair and full account of the whole matter.

It has not been, and we presume it will not be pretended, that we were induced to take these measures from any personal hostility to the accused. We have had no misunderstanding of a personal nature with any of these brethren. On the contrary, with many of them we have been on terms of intimacy, and entertained for them the most friendly regards, cemented and endeared by christian communion and fellowship—and we had no reason to doubt that these feelings were reciprocated. We declare, in the fear of God, we love them still, and are as willing as ever to render them any proper act of kindness and friendship—we have then, a right to hope that whatever opinion may be formed of the propriety of the measures we have taken in relation to these brethren, we shall at least obtain credit for the purity of our motives.

But it has been alleged that we acted under the influence of ministerial authority. That we obeyed the dictum of the preacher in charge, while he himself was put in motion by “persons at a distance high in authority.” This charge has been made by Dr. Jennings in his Protest, and has been reiterated here and elsewhere. We can only meet this charge with a positive and unqualified denial. We *know* that the measures taken in relation to the accused, did not originate with the preacher in charge—nor do we believe that he was even informed that such measures were in contemplation until they were resolved upon—and as to the bishops, who we suppose were intended by the “persons at a distance high in authority,”

ities who went there merely to witness the proceedings, it will be found that according to the capacity of the house, as ascertained by the Union Society on a former occasion, the balance of the meeting must have been composed chiefly of the members of the Union Society, who it is not denied were present and voted for the resolutions and address as published.

we are sure that the proceedings must have considerably progressed before they were informed of it all. But men whose responsibilities sit so easy upon them, may make what assertions they please. The fact is that although the Union Society would persuade the public that the lay-members of our church, are tyrannized over by their ministers, and are dissatisfied with the government—and that it is the cause of their lay brethren that they are so strenuously pleading, yet, it is by these very lay brethren that they have been arraigned and brought to trial—and that too without any itinerant suggestion or influence whatever.

Great pains have been taken to impress the public mind with the belief that the accused have been persecuted for a mere difference of *opinion* with their brethren on the subject of church government, and that we wish and design to restrict the liberty of speech and the freedom of the press. This, however, is very far from being the fact. We regret indeed that any disagreement should exist in the church, on any subject calculated to awaken undue excitement, or to give rise to strife and contention amongst brethren, who have heretofore harmonized both in sentiment and effort—but we have never wished to prevent our brethren who differed from us in opinion, from fully and fairly discussing the subject of church government in general, or of ours in particular. We are not aware that any injury would arise from such a controversy, if it were conducted with proper temper—with a strict regard to truth, and to the feelings and characters of all concerned. In these declarations we believe we speak the sentiments of our brethren generally. We have a common interest in the prosperity of the church, and cannot be injured by any changes in our ecclesiastical economy, which will promote the original design of our institutions, “the universal spread of scripture holiness.” We enjoy no secular advantages from the present order of things. The benefits we derive from our connexion with the methodists are purely spiritual, and whatever would tend to increase these, could not fail to be as much a subject of rejoicing to us as to any of our brethren. We are prepared to follow the leadings of providence, as the methodists have heretofore done, and to adapt our economy to the circumstances of time and place, in such a way as may be deemed best calculated to promote the glory of God and the salvation of mankind. We have no desire, therefore, to suppress inquiry or prevent discussion; and we have no reason to believe that our brethren, either of the ministry or membership, have any wish to do so. Our complaint against the members of the Union Society is not on account of their opinions on the subject of church government, nor for the honest and candid expression of their opi-

nions; but for the misrepresentation of the motives and conduct of our ministers, and for endeavouring to sow dissensions in the church by inveighing against the discipline. Nor do we understand by "inveighing" the temperate expression of opinion, or calm and dispassionate argument in favour of changing any part of our discipline—but we understand it to mean "vehement railing," "abusive censure or reproach." Our opponents will allow us this definition because it is stated and contended for in the "Mutual Rights" by Mr. Shinn. (See Mut. Rig. vol. ii. page 142.) That the finding fault *with* and proposing alterations *of* our discipline are not considered as violations of our discipline is sufficiently manifested by the fact, that numerous petitions were sent up to the last General Conference, which did all this, yet they were nevertheless respectfully considered, and a general answer returned in a circular from the conference.

We repeat then, that it is not for being reformers themselves or for endeavouring to make reformers of others, nor for uttering and publishing their opinions on the subject of reform, that we complain of the members of the Baltimore Union Society, but we complain that they have employed against their brethren in the ministry, and against the discipline of the church, the severest invectives and the most vehement railing. They have impugned the motives of our venerable bishops and our itinerant ministers with unrelenting severity—and accused them without the shadow of proof, with conduct which would render men odious even in civil society, and how much more in the church of God. They represent them to the world as usurpers—as tyrants and despots, "lording it over God's heritage"—as exercising an arbitrary authority, which was at first "SURREPTITIOUSLY" obtained, and which has been perpetuated by printing and publishing, a falsehood in the preface to our book of discipline, and by forbidding the people to inquire into the truth of the affair. Nay more, they are represented as holding opinions and exercising a "domination" highly dangerous to the civil liberties of the country. As being wolves among the lambs of the flock, and wolves too who openly show their "teeth and claws," and to cap the climax, nearly one hundred of these ministers, constituting the Baltimore Annual Conference, the faithful pastors over at least thirty thousand souls, are stigmatised as "abandoned tyrants," as performing "a laboured deed of hard earned infamy." From the extracts which we shall give from the "Mutual Rights," it will be shown that all this has been said of our itinerant ministers, and for these unjust accusations, for these vehement railings, we hold the Union Society accountable; because they have been uttered and published by an editorial committee elected by the society, and who profess to act as its

agents, and under its supervision and control. If there be individuals in the Union Society who disapprove of the measures which have been pursued, but who had not sufficient influence to prevent or control them, let them disavow their participation in these measures, by leaving the society, and they will exonerate themselves from the blame—but while they do not disavow these measures—while they so far countenance them as to let these highly reprehensible publications go out to the world under the sanction of their name and influence, they cannot complain if they are considered as accessory to the evil, which has been done, and may yet be done by the periodical of which we complain.

Some of our friends at a distance, and some even here, have intimated a wish that the proceedings against the members of the Union Society, had been deferred until after the ensuing General Conference shall have decided on the question of reform. But from what we have now stated, it will be seen, that as it respects the accused, it is of no consequence, what may be the determination of the conference, in relation to lay and local representation. It is not for advocating such a representation that we complain of the accused, but for the *means* they have employed to effect their object; if such indeed was their *only* object. Whatever else the General Conference may do, we are sure they will not acknowledge the right of professing christians to abuse and defame one another: and if as some expect, they should make some rule of discipline, calculated more effectually to preserve the peace of the church, it is obvious that such a rule could not have any retrospective operation—any “*expost facto*” application, and therefore could not be brought to bear on the circumstances under which the church now suffers. The peace of the church must be preserved, and the character of her members and ministers protected from unjust aspersions, whatever be the fate of the much agitated question of reform. To do this is all that we have had in view, and to decline any responsibility which may devolve on us, in doing what we conceive necessary to the accomplishment of this object, would we believe be a criminal dereliction of duty.

That the design of the leading members of the Union Society of Baltimore has been, to sow dissention in the church, is not only inferrible from what they have published, but also from the effect which these publications have had in this station. How peaceful and prosperous was the state of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Baltimore a few years ago. What love and harmony every where prevailed among our ministers and membership. What unanimity in our official meetings—what zeal and holy fervour in our classes—our love-feasts—our missionary societies and Sabbath schools. We loved one another as

brethren of the same household and family. We rejoiced in the one hope of our calling, and united in one common effort to promote the cause of God and religion in the world. The rich contributed liberally of their substance for the support of the poor, and the strong hastened to sustain the infirmities of the weak—all seemed animated with a desire to bear one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ. It will probably be acknowledged by all, that there never appeared to be more deep piety in the church, manifesting itself by the works of mercy and the labours of love, than at the period of the establishment of the Union Society in Baltimore. It is true that the Wesleyan Repository had been circulated amongst us for some time previously, but its circulation was very limited, and consequently its influence was but slightly felt. The fire however was secretly kindling, and a few ambitious spirits, were prepared to avail themselves of the first opportunity to fan it into a flame. Some of the most inflammatory writers for that periodical, resided in and near this city, and were already heated by the controversy, and by some private griefs, to such a degree as gave plain intimations of hostile designs against the episcopacy, if not against the itinerant system itself. Whoever will read the letters of "Martin Luther" to the senior bishop—The review of "Bangs on the Episcopacy" and "A Sincere Querist and a Member of a Class" on class-meeting as a term of membership, cannot fail to discover the buddings of that bitter fruit, which has since ripened in such fatal profusion.

Just before the meeting of the General Conference of 1821, some interest existing on the subject of reform, and the opinions of brethren being very various in relation to it, a general meeting (though not official) of the male members in the city was called, for the purpose of effecting a compromise, and of uniting in a memorial to the General Conference. At this meeting a committee was appointed to draft a memorial, and report to a subsequent meeting. The committee was purposely composed of brethren who were known to differ in opinion on the subject of lay and local representation, but who were generally esteemed moderate men. These brethren acting in the spirit of compromise, reported a memorial, which after undergoing some slight amendments was passed, signed by the chairman and secretary,* and laid before the conference. The ground of compromise was, that on the one side the claim of "RIGHT" to a lay delegation should be waived, and a distinct acknowledgement made that the claim ought to rest entirely on the "expediency" of the measure—and on the other, that those who desired a lay delegation, should embody in the memorial whatever they could

* Thomas Kelso, chairman, and Thomas E. Bond, secretary.

say in favour of its "EXPEDIENCY" or probable utility. On the other subjects embraced in the memorial there appeared to be no difference of opinion.

That part of the memorial which related to representation, was in the following words, to wit:

"Under these views we have been led to turn our attention to the subject of a lay delegation to the General Conference. In presenting this subject to your consideration, we would waive all that might be urged on the natural or abstract right of the membership to this privilege. We are content to admit that all governments, whether civil or ecclesiastical, ought to be founded, not on considerations growing out of abstract rights, but on *expediency*, that being always the right government which best secures the interests of the whole community. With regard to the expediency of the measure, then, we may urge that such a delegation would bring into the conference much information with regard to the temporal affairs of the church, which the ministry cannot well be supposed to possess. They would feel less delicacy in originating and proposing measures for the relief of the preachers' families than the preachers themselves, as they could not be subjected thereby to the imputation of interested motives, and they would, by being distributed every where amongst the membership, aid by their personal exertions and influence the success of such measures; and awaken more generally than has hitherto been done, the attention of the methodist community to the great interests of the church.

"We are aware of the constitutional objections to this change in our economy. We know that you are clearly prohibited by the very first article of the constitution, under which you act, from adding to the conference any delegation not provided for in that rule; but we believe that an opinion expressed by the conference, and approved by the episcopacy, would induce the Annual Conferences to make the necessary alteration in the constitution, and we submit the consideration of the whole matter to the calm and deliberate attention, which we are persuaded its importance demands, and which we do not doubt it will receive; determined cheerfully and cordially to submit to your decision."

For this memorial, as the basis of compromise, all the leading reformers, who are now members of the Union Society, voted, and most of the old side brethren who attended the meeting. We advert to these facts, to show that the brethren in Baltimore, who have not seen the necessity of the contemplated innovation upon our church economy, so far from denying the privilege of others, to petition for them, or to argue in favour of them, united with those who wished to have such

changes, in a memorial, in which the reformers said all they wished to say in favour of their measures. It will be seen that the memorialists submitted the whole matter to the conference, *with a promise cheerfully to abide their decision.*

During the session of conference, however, some of the reformers abandoning the principles of the compromise, formed themselves into a separate society, and forthwith proceeded to issue proposals for the publication of a periodical paper, to be called "The Mutual Rights." Departing from the principles which had been agreed on, they now claimed a direct representation in the General Conference, as the natural and social right of the local preachers and lay members; and the consequence which naturally followed was, that all who resisted this claim were tyrants, and despots, and monarchists, &c. This consequence was predicted at the time, and the event has fully verified the prediction; as we shall presently show by the quotations we shall make from "The Mutual Rights" itself.

The formation of the Union Society was in fact the organization of a schism, the erection of "imperium in imperio," and forms a distinct era in the history of this controversy. But for this unfortunate step, the discussion of the various projects of reform might have gone on without producing any general and injurious excitement in the church; the arguments on each side might have been presented with calmness, and been weighed without prejudice; and truth clearly and frequently exhibited, would ultimately have prevailed, whether it had decided for or against the proposed changes. The temerity of individuals, who, in the prosecution of the inquiry, should have indulged any undue violence, or vented any personal spleen, would have been repressed by the rebuke of public feeling and sentiment; they would have stood alone, and unsupported by party array and compact. The identity of interest, feeling and object, which necessarily exists between our ministry and membership, would have ensured success to any proposals for altering our economy, which could have been shown to be necessary for the common good. But the organizing a *separate, secret* society within the pale of the church, incorporated the spirit of party in its very constitution. The members of such an association, could not help feeling that they had drawn a line of separation between themselves and their brethren who differed with them in opinion: that they were in some sense adversaries—and how difficult is it for adversaries to love one another. In this associate and systematic opposition to the government of the church, they had a right to expect their brethren would look upon their efforts to make proselytes, with distrust and jealousy—that they would be opposed as a hostile party, and that under whatever plausible pretexts they had associated, they

would be suspected of a real design, either to overawe the government or to prepare an extensive secession from the church, if they should fail in modelling it according to their own wishes.

We have no hesitation in saying that we believe many, nay a large proportion of those who have entered the Union Society of Baltimore, entered it simply with a view to effect, what they believed would be a salutary reform in the government of our church; but it was not difficult to foresee that such a society would soon come to be governed by a few master spirits, who possessed other views. Men, who from superior talents and management, would acquire a covered, yet absolute ascendancy over their associates. Whatever *ambitious* projects these leaders might indulge, it could not be expected they should avow them. When accomplished, they were to appear as the result of uncontrollable necessity. If a congregational plan of church government was contemplated, it was not at all necessary to declaim against the *itinerant system*, nay this might be extravagantly praised—all that was necessary to be done, was to alienate the affections of the people from the *itinerant preachers*: and this could be accomplished by representing them as “tyrants and despots, lording it over God’s heritage.” Meantime the Union Society would rally under its banners, all who had or supposed they had any cause of dissatisfaction with the discipline of the church, or those who administered it. However various and discordant their views, all would be taught to look to the contemplated reform, as a sovereign remedy for their several grievances. Whether because all slave holders, however circumstanced, were not expelled from the church—or because females were not permitted to occupy our pulpits—or because they had felt the wholesome rod of discipline themselves—or because they had been offended by some bishop or itinerant preacher—or because, as local preachers, their merits had not been duly appreciated, ALL WOULD BE REFORMERS. The heterogeneous materials could be easily moulded by these leaders to suit their purposes. If the recruits were at first lukewarm they would soon imbibe the esprit du corps. Their zeal could not fail to be inflamed, by the warm addresses which would be poured forth at their frequent meetings. Impassioned declamations on liberty and equality—the glorious news of the success of the cause which would be said to come from all quarters, in despite of the unhallowed efforts of the priesthood to prevent it, would at once elicit the joy and arouse the indignation of the hearers, and “on brethren on” would become the watchword of the party.

This unhappy state of things could not fail to be aggravated by the conflict of personal controversy. The brethren no longer *consulted* one another, upon the subject of reform, as having

one common interest in the question—they *debated*, and *contended*, as opposite parties, each determined on victory. The bond of mutual confidence and brotherly love was broken, and the unhappy consequences began to be felt, not only in our religious meetings, but in families—carrying strife and discord even to the family altar. We will not say that none but the members of the Union Society acted or spoke indiscreetly in this state of excitement. *They* were obviously the aggressors; but some of the other side might and probably did indulge too much temper and speak unadvisedly. A general disposition to forbear however, prevailed among the friends of the church, and a manifest reluctance existed, to use any means of defence but those of expostulation and enureaty. The leaders of the Union Society, on the contrary, emboldened by the impunity with which they were permitted to go on, ventured at length upon measures which exhausted all forbearance, and cut off the last, lingering, fondly cherished hope of reconciliation.

During the session of the Annual Conference in this city in April last, the Rev. D. B. Dorsey was accused of recommending and circulating the “Mutual Rights,” which the conference thought an “improper periodical work,” from the temper and spirit in which it was conducted. In the course of his trial he made such declarations, and avowed such principles, as induced the conference to request the bishop to leave him without an appointment for one year. It was known in fact, that his health did not justify his taking an appointment, and that he would have been compelled to take a superannuated relation, had no allegations been preferred against him. It was thought, therefore, that the measure resorted to was the mildest by which the conference could express its disapprobation; as it did not affect him in a pecuniary point of view. From the decision of the Annual Conference Mr. Dorsey took an appeal to the General Conference, and here the matter ought to have been permitted to rest, at least until the final decision was had on the appeal. Soon after the recess of the conference, however, the appellant sent a statement of the case to the editors of the “Mutual Rights,” and this statement was in part sustained by the communications of *two anonymous writers*. On this *exparte* testimony, the Union Society, held a meeting and passed resolutions, which they published in the newspapers; in which the conduct of the conference was condemned and denounced in very severe terms.

Two of these resolutions were in these words. To wit:

“Therefore, Resolved first, That the conduct of the late Baltimore Annual Conference, in the case of the Rev. Dennis B. Dorsey, was OPPRESSIVE in its character, and not warranted by the *scriptures*, nor the discipline of the church.”

“Resolved secondly, That in the opinion of this society, the conference in thus oppressing Mr. Dorsey, has evinced a determination, not only to withhold representation from the membership and local ministry, but also to keep them in ignorance of the true principles of church government.”

We do not think it necessary here, to enter into the vindication of the Baltimore Annual Conference. That has been already done: but we do not hesitate to say, that the history of no modern church, furnishes a parallel to this outrage on all the social obligations which grow out of church membership—nearly one hundred ministers of the gospel—many of them venerable for their age, and all beloved for their usefulness and piety. The laborious pastors over at least thirty thousand souls—are tried, and condemned, and denounced in the public newspapers, by a self-created society, and at the time too, a part of the pastoral charge of these very ministers! And that too without giving them the privilege accorded to the worst criminals—of coming into court—pleading to the indictment—examining the evidences, and of making their defence. And all this too, when the person complaining had cited them before a higher tribunal, and one of whose competency neither party had ever intimated any doubt!!! Something like this we have seen and deplored in political electioneering—but never before, and we trust in God never shall again, in a religious society. Whatever sympathy the Union Society expressed for their MARTYR Mr. Dorsey, it could be easily perceived that they greatly rejoiced in the occurrence. The cry of persecution was worth a thousand specious arguments, if they could but make out a plausible pretext for the complaint: and it must be acknowledged they made the most of appearances. They wrote and published and circulated their highly coloured statements, with an industry worthy of a better cause, and as no timely effort was made to counteract them, a very extensive ferment was produced by their statements. Mean while the “Mutual Rights” teemed with invective and abuse against the denounced ministry. The Rev. N. Snethen, in an address to reformers, tells them they are “lambs among wolves.” These itinerant preachers, says he, “have all the teeth and all the claws, and therefore every man may be made to fear.” The advice of our Saviour to his followers, to be “wise as serpents and harmless as doves,” is perverted into an exhortation to employ the wisdom of “THE SERPENT.” In short, the world are advertised that our itinerant ministry are wolves, and that they no longer deem it necessary to appear in sheep’s clothing, but intend to carry their point by “teeth and claws.” If he is believed, in vain will these ministers of Christ go into the hedges and highways to bring sinners to repentance—who would believe their report, or who would attend their mi-

nistry? And who would supply their place? Why, Mr. Sneath and his reforming brethren among the local preachers, to be sure.

Outrageous as was this address it was destined to be outdone and thrown into the shade, by a writer under the signature of "Vindex," whose communication appeared in the "Mutual Rights" the May following. This reckless assailant transcends all decency of invective. The decision of the Baltimore Conference in relation to Mr. Dorsey is denounced as "*an overbearing act of abandoned TYRANNY;*" "*a laboured deed of HARD EARNED INFAMY!!!*" And the conference were stigmatized with the odious appellation of a "star chamber court."

About this time, or a little before, the "History and Mystery of Methodist Episcopacy, by Alex. McCaine," made its appearance—in which our present ecclesiastical government was represented as surreptitious—a fraud practised on the membership by the bishops and travelling preachers—imposed upon them in the name of Mr. Wesley, without his sanction, and even contrary to his express commands!! And it is more than intimated that this surreptitious government was supported by the suppression of documents, garbling of statements, the forgery of dates, and falsifying of records!! All these allegations were known to be unfounded; and they have since been clearly disproved by Dr. Emory in his able "Defence of our Fathers." What added greatly to the indignation with which Mr. McCaine's work was read by the friends of the church, was that it was written by a minister of long standing amongst us, who had been raised to distinction by the connexion; who was a file-leader in the Union Society, and who stated in his preface, that "*the result of his investigation was read before the Union Society of reformers in Baltimore; and the writer was requested to print it for the information of his brethren.*" This declaration was corroborated by the fact, that many members of the Union Society circulated the work with the utmost industry. That they had contributed largely to aid the publication, and rejoiced over it as a lever which was to overturn the whole superstructure of our church polity. The Union Society were thus identified with Mr. McCaine in the publishing and circulating his pamphlet. And although they have since denied, (and Mr. McCaine has concurred in the denial) that they ever took a vote on the subject; yet the co-partnership in the whole business cannot be doubted.*

* The circumstances as they occurred in the Union Society when Mr. McCaine read his manuscript, were thus detailed afterwards by a prominent member. "Dr. Jennings made a motion, that the society print the work at its own expense—this motion was seconded by Rev. Daniel E. Reese, and was likely to prevail, when a lay-man observed, that there could be no doubt that all

We may add, that most of the unfounded allegations made against Mr. Asbury, Dr. Coke, and the travelling preachers who composed the conference of 1784, in Mr. McCaine's pamphlet, are reiterated in the *Mutual Rights*. It was evident now to the most incredulous that these measures could not be the work of reformers but of revolutionists. Their object could not be to amend but to destroy. And there was combined in this effort men, and means, and a recklessness of consequences, which threatening the existing institutions of the church with destruction, afforded no hope that any permanent and well ordered superstructure would ever be erected on the ruins.

All hope of returning peace was now cut off, and those who had all along discouraged the enforcement of discipline on the offenders, lest it should afford them the plea of persecution, with which to enlist the feelings of the community, began reluctantly, to yield to the absolute necessity of the measure. In fact human patience, even the meekness of christianity could endure no more. They saw their beloved pastors and ministers, through whose instrumentality they had been brought to or preserved in the hope of the gospel, and who had encountered and endured all sorts of privations, in their laborious and unremitting efforts to bring others to the enjoyment of the *unsearchable riches*, held up to the scorn of the world, their characters assailed and their usefulness hindered, by those whose duty it was to protect and sustain them:—while the enemies of godliness were rejoicing as those who had taken great spoil. Even christians of other denominations began to inquire, whether the methodists had no discipline, by which such improprieties could be punished and the reproach rolled away.

In this state of things, a meeting of a considerable number of the male members of the church, took place in consequence of the invitation of one or two brethren, *exclusively* with a view to the publication of a statement of facts in relation to the case of Mr. Dorsey, and a defence of the conference. After some discussion it was determined to appoint a committee to take

who should be concerned in the publication would be liable to be expelled from the church; that although he approved the work, and would subscribe for it, yet if he were on a committee to try the publishers of it under a charge of violating the discipline, he should, as an honest man, be obliged to find them guilty. The local preachers he said might be, and no doubt would be protected by the District Conference; but the lay-men would have to go before the Quarterly Meeting Conference, and would certainly be expelled; he was therefore opposed to the motion. The motion was withdrawn, or at least not acted upon." The lay-member's opinion with respect to what the District Conference would do in the case, was probably predicated on the fact, that the local preachers who were members of the Union Society in Baltimore, usually constituted a majority of the District Conference; few members of that body finding it convenient, or being disposed to attend its meetings.

the subject into consideration, and to report to a subsequent meeting, to be called by notice given in all our churches in both stations on the following sabbath. The business of the meeting being accomplished, it was about to break up, when it was suggested, that inasmuch as great discontent prevailed in the church, on account of the impunity with which the Union Society were permitted to publish their unfounded accusations; and illiberal remarks in reference to their brethren, it was necessary that some measures should be taken to remedy the evil; and after some desultory conversation, it was agreed that the undersigned should enquire into the matter, and take such measures as they should, after mature deliberation and inquiry, deem necessary.

After a careful examination of the periodical and the pamphlet complained of, the undersigned were unanimously of opinion, that they contained such unjust statements and cruel imputations, that their authors and publishers ought to be dealt with according to our discipline; and they determined forthwith to visit the members of the Union Society, to admonish them of their error, and expostulate with them on the evil which their publications had already produced in the church—the dissensions, strife and contentions which they had so obviously effected, and would necessarily diffuse and aggravate if persisted in. Therefore, preparatory to such a course, we made an effort to obtain the names of the members of the Union Society, by addressing the following note to Mr. John Chappell, president of the Society:

Baltimore, August 17, 1827.

The undersigned, believing that the members of the Baltimore Union Society have violated the discipline of the Methodist Episcopal church, and being desirous to have a friendly interview with them previous to instituting charges against them, if necessary, therefore we respectfully request to be furnished with the names of the members of the said Union Society.

GEORGE EARNEST,
JACOB ROGERS,
ISAAC N. TOY,
SAMUEL HARDEN,
ALEXANDER YEARLEY,
JOHN BERRY,
FIELDER ISRAEL,

} Members of the Methodist Episcopal church.

To Mr. JOHN CHAPPELL, *Pres't*
of the *Baltimore Union Society.*

To which the following reply was given:

Baltimore August 21st, 1827.

DEAR BRETHREN,

Waiving for the present, any objections that may lie against the authority under which you act, I have to inform you that the next meeting of the Baltimore Union Society will be held on the first Tuesday in September, at which time your communication requesting "to be furnished with the names of the members of said Union Society" shall be laid before them, immediately after which meeting, I will inform you of the result. In the mean time,

I remain yours respectfully,

JNO. CHAPPELL.

To Messrs. George Earnest, Jacob Rogers, }
Isaac N. Toy, Samuel Harden, Alexander }
Yearley, John Berry, Fielder Israel. }

And subsequently we received the following communication and resolution of the Union Society on the subject:

September 5th, 1827.

DEAR BRETHREN,

The following preamble and resolution, passed by the Union Society, is respectfully submitted.

Yours, &c.

JNO. CHAPPELL.

"Union Society, Baltimore, Sept. 4, 1827.

"Whereas brothers George Earnest, Jacob Rogers, Isaac N. Toy, Samuel Harden, Alexander Yearley, John Berry and Fielder Israel, have requested, by a note addressed to the President of the Union Society of the Methodist Episcopal church, the names of the members of the said Society; and have stated, as a reason for said application, their belief that the members aforesaid 'have violated the discipline,' and have intimated a design to 'institute charges against them, if necessary:' Therefore,

"*Resolved*, That the President be instructed to request those brethren, to state particularly what part of the discipline they believe those members have violated; and in what particular instance or instances.

"We believe those brethren owe us the above information, in virtue of the attitude which they have voluntarily assumed, in relation to this Society; and also, that it is needful to our acting understandingly on their application."

Having failed to obtain the names, we commenced visiting such of the members as were known to us. Two of the brethren waited upon the Rev. Dr. S. K. Jennings. They report their interview with the Doctor to have lasted about two hours. They were received with politeness, and the conversation which ensued was conducted on both sides with perfectly good temper, and with a good degree of christian feeling. The two brethren chiefly adverted to the effects which had been produced by the measures pursued by the Union Society in Baltimore—the injury which the church had sustained by the inflammatory publications in the “Mutual Rights,” and the public papers—the unfounded allegations against our ministers, and the abusive epithets which had been applied to them. They adverted also to the “History and Mystery of Methodist Episcopacy by Mr. McCaine,” a work which had been read in manuscript before the Union Society, and which, they understood was approved and recommended by the members of that Society. They called the Doctor’s attention to former times, when he had been so useful—and when the church enjoyed so much peace and concord—when he had so happily contributed to build us up in the faith of the gospel, and when we were kept in the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace. They contrasted our former peaceful and happy state with the present agitated and divided condition of the church—now that party spirit and party feelings had entered even into families and set husband and wife, parents and children at variance. They urged the Doctor to take the necessary steps to restore harmony, love and peace to our afflicted Zion; and tracing all the evils which the church now suffered, to the Union Society and the improper publications which had emanated from that source; they represented the necessity of his using his influence to procure a dissolution of the association, or of his withdrawing from it, and of ceasing to publish any work characterized by the violent spirit in which the “Mutual Rights” had been heretofore conducted. The brethren stated explicitly, that they did not wish or require the Doctor to make a sacrifice of conscience or of principle: he could still be, and avow himself a reformer, and could speak, write and petition in a temperate and christian-like manner in favour of reform, and yet retain the love and confidence of his brethren; and, what was of still more consequence, return to his former usefulness in the church: but inasmuch as the Union Society and “Mutual Rights” had become so completely identified with the evils of which they complained, they deemed it indispensable that he should dissolve his connexion with them.

On the part of the Doctor, it was admitted that there were some expressions in the “Mutual Rights” which were severe,

and of which he disapproved; but yet the sentiments were true, and that the Union Society intended to proceed in their usual way regardless of consequences. They would not be deterred from their course by the prosecutions which he understood were intended. As to the "History and Mystery of Methodist Episcopacy," he said it was not published by the Union Society, nor upon their responsibility: but he thought the publication of it at this time rather a fortunate circumstance, as an opportunity was thereby afforded to the church to rebut the charges by proper evidence, *if it could be done*, before the time should pass in which the evidence could be collected. He talked much of the liberty of speech and of the press, and of their rights being guaranteed by the constitution of the United States and those of the individual states—complained of the neglect and silence with which the church had treated their opinions and arguments—and as to what we required of him, he considered it an attack on his natural and religious rights; and if we proceeded in the prosecution, he would appeal to heaven and earth for their glaring injustice. The brethren informed the Doctor, that they did not wish to infringe his rights, but that it could not be his right to sow dissensions in the church, by publishing such statements as were to be found in the periodical of which they complained, nor could it be any body's right to defame and abuse others, as our ministry and even our venerable fathers who slept in Jesus, had been defamed and abused in the "Mutual Rights." They stated how impossible it was for most of those who would read that work, to have access to the necessary information to enable them to form a correct judgment, on the cruel allegations which had been made—and how readily the enemies of our church and of godliness in general would believe them without any examination at all. But nothing could move the Doctor, or induce him to yield any thing of the right he claimed to publish whatever he deemed necessary to the cause of reform. The interview however terminated as it began, in the most friendly manner—and it was with feelings of surprise as well as mortification that they heard the Doctor at his subsequent trial, before the committee, speak of their attentions to him as "a pretended godly visit." It was sincerely intended, and as they thought, sincerely received, as a visit enjoined by our obligations as christians to a christian minister: and although their object in making it was not effected, they had and still have the unspeakable consolation, of having discharged to the best of their ability a christian duty to a misguided and erring brother.*

* The brethren complained of some leading reformers, who contend, in opposition to the discipline, that we ought not to make class meetings a condition

Some of us visited other members of the Union Society: but with a few exceptions were not received with the urbanity and kindness which characterised the conduct of Dr. Jennings. The Rev. J. R. Williams grossly insulted one of us in his own house. Mr. McCaine sent us word not to visit him, as he should take it as an insult, and should probably insult us: and finally the president of the Union Society informed us that it was useless to visit the members, as they had determined not to yield, or make any concessions. We have since learned that a meeting of the society was called on the occasion, and after some warm addresses, a pledge was given by the holding up of hands, to stand by each other and to abide the consequences together.

Thus circumstanced, nothing remained but to lay our complaints before the church, and accordingly the following charges and specifications were handed to the preacher in charge, against eleven local preachers, to wit:—Rev. Dr. S. K. Jennings, Alexander McCaine, John C. French, James R. Williams, Daniel E. Reese, John Valiant, William Kesley, Thomas McCormick, Luther J. Cox, John S. Reese, and Reuben T. Boyd. —And twenty-five lay members, to wit:—Messrs. John Chappell, John Kennard, John J. Harrod, Thomas Mumme, Ebenezer Strahan, Arthur Emmerson, Lambert Thomas, Thomas Patterson, Levi R. Reese, John Hawkins, John P. Howard, Wesley Starr, John P. Paul, Joseph R. Foreman, William K. Boyle, Samuel Jarrett, Thomas Jarrett, Samuel Guest, George B. Northerman, Samuel Krebs, Samuel Thompson, Thomas Parsons, John Coates, John Stinchcomb, and Jesse Comegys.

“—— is charged with endeavouring to sow dissensions in the society or church in this station or city, known by the name of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and with the violation of that general rule of the discipline of the said church or society which prohibits its members from doing harm, and requires them to avoid evil of every kind; and especially with violating that clause of said general rule, which prohibits speaking evil of ministers.

“*Specification I.* Because the said —— while a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church aforesaid, did heretofore attach himself to, and become a member of the society called ‘The Union Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the city of Baltimore,’—which Union Society is in opposition to

of church membership. The Doctor replied, that he did hold it to be wrong to make class meetings a test of membership in the church—and that the New Testament was his discipline. They replied, it was lamentable to contemplate the state of disunion in the church which that principle would lead to.

the discipline, in whole or in part, of the Methodist Episcopal Church aforesaid.

"Specification II. Because the said ——— as a member of the said Union Society, is directly or indirectly, either by pecuniary contributions, or his personal influence, aiding, abetting, co-operating or assisting in the publication or circulation of a work called 'The Mutual Rights of the Ministers and Members of the Methodist Episcopal Church,' printed under the direction of an Editorial Committee, appointed by, or who are members of, the Union Society aforesaid,—which work or publication called 'The Mutual Rights of the Ministers and Members of the Methodist Episcopal Church,' contains (among other things) much that enveighs against the discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church aforesaid, in whole or in part, and is in direct opposition thereto:—and that is abusive, or speaks evil of a part, if not most of the ministers of that church. The general tendency of which work or publication, has been to produce, and continues to produce, disagreement, strife, contention, and breach of union among the members of said church in this city or station.

"Specification III. Because the said ——— as a member of the Union Society aforesaid, did advise, request, or recommend the publication of a pamphlet, entitled, 'The History and Mystery of Methodist Episcopacy,' written by the Rev. Alexander McCaine, in which various declarations and assertions are made, without proper proof or just foundation, calculated to disgrace and bring reproach upon the Methodist Episcopal Church aforesaid, its ministers and members: and which declarations and assertions are well calculated to produce, increase, and heighten the disagreement, strife, contention and breach of union alluded to in the second specification.

"For proof of which, the publication entitled 'The Mutual Rights of the Ministers and Members of the Methodist Episcopal Church,' is referred to, and particularly,

No. 1, page 31. Constitution of Union Society of Baltimore.

7, " 261. Essay on Church Property, No. 1 and 2, by Rev. N. Snethen.

25, " 26. Jos. Walker's Letter, Alabama.

27, " 53. Luther on Representation.

29, " 108. Timothy's Address to Junior Bishop.

30, " 147. Dissenter.

32, " 199. Rev. A. Shinn's Appeal.

33, " 214. Granville Union Society.

34, " 270. Vindex.

ib. Sovereignty of the Methodists in the South.

248. Address of N. Snethen.

35, " 277. Union Society on D. B. Dorsey's case.

No. 36, page 301. Address.

308. Neale.

322. Centreville Proceedings.—

“And also the said pamphlet entitled, ‘The History and Mystery of Methodist Episcopacy’—with such other documentary or oral proof as the undersigned may deem expedient to exhibit or produce.

GEORGE EARNEST,
JACOB ROGERS,
ISAAC N. TOY,
SAMUEL HARDEN,
ALEXANDER YEARLEY,
JOHN BERRY,
FIELDER ISRAEL.

Baltimore, September 7, 1827.”

The preacher in charge, caused each of the persons accused to be furnished with a copy of the charges and specifications, as above, and notified them of the time appointed for their trials severally. The committee appointed to examine the cases of the local preachers (except Mr. McCaine’s case) were the Rev. John W. Harris, Samuel Williams, and Thos. Bassford.

The committee on Mr. McCaine’s case, were taken, two from the country and one from the East Baltimore station, to wit:—Rev. Samuel Gore, Nicholas Harden, and Edward Hall.

The committee appointed to try the lay-members were, brethren Baltzer Schaeffer, Thomas Kelso, Alexander Russell, Thomas Armstrong, John W. Berry and William McConkey, Junr.

After these charges had been laid before the preacher in charge of the station, Doctor Bond who had not yet relinquished the hope that some conciliatory course might be devised by which the necessity of further proceedings before the constituted authorities of the church might be removed, and who had not heretofore taken any part in the measures which had been adopted, in reference to the accused, ventured alone and without our knowledge upon the business of negotiation. Having a particular intimacy with the Rev. J. S. Reese, and reposing great confidence in his understanding, piety and prudence, the doctor communicated his intentions to him. Mr Reese met the offer with readiness, and promised to be the bearer of any proposals the doctor might be disposed to make to the Union Society. Accordingly the following proposals were sent. To wit:

“Whereas the Union Society of reformers, have assigned as their motive in forming the association the attainment of unanimity in their intended memorial or petition to the next General Conference—and whereas that object is expected to be ac-

accomplished by the General Convention of reformers which is to take place in November next, I am disposed to use my personal influence to procure (so far as that small influence may extend) a suspension of proceedings before the church, upon the following conditions. To wit:

“*First.* When the convention shall have terminated its session, the Union Society shall be dissolved, and not re-organized, in the present or any other form until after the next General Conference.

“*Secondly.* That the periodical called the ‘Mutual Rights,’ if continued at all, shall be strictly confined, (so far as relates to the controversy with respect to our church government,) to dispassionate, temperate discussion, and that no allusions to individuals or attribution of improper motives to any individuals, or to the rulers of the church, shall at any time hereafter appear in that periodical.

“To secure the fulfilment of the last condition, each number of that work, in the proof sheets, or the materials before they are printed, shall be submitted to three persons *chosen mutually* by the reformers and the committee who have preferred charges against some of them, who shall be authorised to expunge all objectionable passages therefrom.

“In making this proposition I wish it to be distinctly understood that I act alone and as a mediator—and that I have not consulted with any of the old-side brethren on the subject, nor with any reformer except brother John S. Reese.

THOS. E. BOND.

TO REV. J. S. REESE.

September 15th, 1827.”

The Rev. Mr. Reese returned the above proposals stating that the paper had been read in the Union Society, but that no order had been taken upon it—nor was he authorized in any way to continue the negotiation. It is needless to add, that the Doctor relinquished his hopes and did not again tender his mediation. We have heard it objected to the above proposals, that they were not official, but the mere propositions of an individual, and therefore could not be received by the Union Society. But it must be obvious that in this stage of the business, no official propositions could be made by the church authorities, because it had not been officially determined that any offence had been committed, much less had the nature of the offence and the satisfaction due to the church been ascertained—any compromise then which could take place must be between the accusers and the accused; and between these the Doctor proposed to become the mediator.

If the terms were objectionable, they might have been modified, had the negotiation continued. They were obviously only propositions of compromise, and might have been properly met

by propositions from those to whom they were offered, and ultimately the negotiation might have terminated in a way mutually acceptable.

But the fact is the proposition was received as the effect of intimidation—it was thought by the leading members of the Union Society, that the measures already taken were not intended to be followed up. The church authorities it was believed would not dare to proceed to extremities; and if we are not misinformed, the Doctor's proposals were styled in the Union Society "a flag of truce," and treated with the utmost contempt and derision. Mean time the proceedings against the accused went on. Some of those who had been cited to trial refused to appear. Of those who did appear, a few only condescended to make any defence. The rest contented themselves with technical objections to the proceedings, to the committees who were appointed to try them, and to the preacher in charge, who had cited them to trial, and who presided during the proceedings.

After having patiently heard all that the accused chose to say or read in their defence; and after a long and minute investigation of the periodical and the pamphlet, which were adduced in evidence, on the part of those who had preferred the charges, the committees came unanimously to the following decisions, to wit:—

In the cases of the lay-men. "That the charges, together with the first and second specifications were sustained." "That the third specification was not sustained." To support the third specification, those who preferred the charges had relied entirely upon the declaration heretofore quoted from the preface of Mr. McCaine's "History and Mystery," namely that "*the result of his investigation was read before the Union Society of Reformers in Baltimore; and the writer was requested to print it for the information of his brethren.*" The accused having denied that the Union Society had ever officially made such a request; and Mr. McCaine himself declaring that he did not mean to convey that idea, the committees very properly found, that the third specification was not sustained. The charges and specifications against the local preachers being the same as those against the lay-members, (except in the case of A. McCaine,) and the evidence in support of the allegations being also the same, the committee on their cases gave the same verdict, with this addition, in pursuance of the requirements of the discipline, "that they be suspended until the meeting of the next District Conference."

In the case of Mr. McCaine, the charges, together with the first and second specification were the same as in the other cases, the third specification was in the following words:

"Specification III. Because the said Alexander McCaine, as the author of a book or pamphlet entitled, 'The History and Mystery of Methodist Episcopacy,' has therein made, without proper proof or just foundation, various declarations and assertions, calculated to disgrace and bring reproach upon the Methodist Episcopal Church aforesaid, its ministers and members; and which declarations and assertions are well calculated to produce, increase and heighten the disagreement, strife, contention and breach of union alluded to in the second specification."

The committee found that the charges and specifications were all sustained, and suspended him according to discipline, until the meeting of the ensuing District Conference.

One of the lay-men who had been charged (brother Coates) was acquitted; and brothers Comegys and Stinchcomb appearing agreeably to notification, and those who preferred the charges not attending, claimed to be discharged, and their plea was admitted. It appears that there had been some misunderstanding as to the time of trial, on the part of those preferring the charges. For this, however, the Rev. Mr. Hanson thought the accused were in no way answerable, and accordingly dismissed the charges.

None of the lay-members availed themselves of their privilege of appeal to the Quarterly Meeting Conference, and of course were expelled. Previously to their expulsion however the preacher in charge addressed to each of them a note, proposing terms on which they might yet retain their membership, a copy of which will be found in the Rev. Mr. Hanson's communication in the Appendix. The District (or local preachers') Conference, having refused to hold their regular session;* the cases of the suspended local preachers according to the express provisions of the discipline, came up before the succeeding Quarterly Meeting Conference of the Baltimore City station. The suspended preachers had previously sent to the president of the conference, their protest, both against the dissolution of the District Conference, and the competency of any tribunal short of the General Conference, to take cognizance of their cases; which protest was read. The president having announced, officially, that the District Conference according to the record of its proceedings was dissolved, the Quarterly Meeting Conference, after the ordinary business had been done, took the cases of the suspended preachers up in order. At this period of the proceedings, a communication to the conference, from Doctor John C. Green, of Virginia, was handed to the president by the

*For the "Reply" to the "Protest" against this procedure see Appendix, letter "B."

secretary, and ordered to be read. In this communication Dr. Green informed the conference that he came to Baltimore for the purpose of mediating a reconciliation between the church and the accused members and ministers. He transmitted to the conference certain letters which had passed between himself and Dr. Jennings on the subject, and asked a suspension of proceedings for twenty-four hours. The best feelings pervaded the conference on this interesting occasion, and a motion being made to adjourn until the next evening, it was carried without a dissenting voice. The next evening, (Thursday,) the doctor communicated no progress in the negotiation, but informed the conference, that he had made a proposal to the Union Society (who were to meet the same evening) to appoint a committee to confer with a similar committee to be appointed by the conference. From a compliance with this request, the conference were prevented by insuperable difficulties. To appoint such a committee, would be to justify all that had been alleged by the accused, of the predetermination of the members to condemn them. How were the committee to know what satisfaction to require for the church, of those whom the church had not yet officially decided to be guilty of any offence at all. For it must be distinctly kept in view, that the committee who had previously sat on the cases now before the conference, were only a committee of enquiry. The trial of their cases could only take place before the Quarterly Meeting Conference. But another, and if possible a still greater objection to the proposal was that the committee, with whom the conference committee were intended to negotiate, were to be appointed by the Union Society, a body not recognized by our discipline, and of whom the church could demand nothing, as many of the members of that society had not yet been brought to trial under any allegation whatever.

All that the conference could do, as a judicatory before whom the suspended preachers were ruled for trial, was done. It adjourned its session from day to day, in order to afford an opportunity for those lay-members who might yet wish to appeal, and for the suspended preachers, to place their cases before the conference under the most favourable circumstances. If they believed themselves in any degree culpable, or if Dr. Green, the mediator, should be of the opinion and should be able to convince them, that they owed any satisfaction or atonement to the church, they would of course act accordingly, and the conference thought it a duty to afford time for the adjustment. The several adjournments were—from Wednesday until Thursday—then until Friday, and lastly until Monday—when the Doctor informed the conference, that the negotiation had been broken off, by the Union Society declining to hold further com-

munication with him upon the subject.* It is proper to mention, that the Doctor stated frequently, while in town, that he had left home and undertaken the negotiation without any solicitation from any person in this city—and we believe that no person here knew of his intention until he avowed it himself after his arrival. To have failed in his laudable design, is no doubt a source of painful regret; but he ought to be consoled with a consciousness of having done his best, and in the best way—and perhaps as much as any man could have done under like circumstances—we are sorry we had it not in our power to congratulate him on the success of his pious endeavours, but we can and do tender him our thanks, our love and our esteem.

The conference, after the failure of the negotiation had been announced, proceeded with the trials severally, and such was the effect produced by the reading of the passages from the “Mutual Rights,” on which the charges rested, that although much difference of opinion was known to have previously existed among the members, in reference to the cases before them, yet there was no dissenting vote on the motion to expel. It ought to be observed, that most of the suspended local preachers did not attend, and those who were present declined making any defence, nor did any of them take an appeal to the annual conference; so that the decision is final.

It is now ascertained that a great proportion of the conference, so far from having made up their opinion, before the trial, as has been so often alleged, had not even read the “Mutual Rights” at all: and therefore could not have made up a premature verdict. We are aware that it has been intimated, that the conference, consisting of more than one hundred men, were the mere tools of the preacher in charge. If any can believe this slander, we shall not attempt to disturb their credulity. We should think the conference degraded by any defence against this vile and unfounded insinuation.

The final resolutions of the conference in the cases severally, (except Mr. McCaine’s) were as follows:

“*Resolved 1st.* That the charges against ——— with the 1st and 2d specifications are sustained.

“*Resolved 2d.* That the 3d specification is not sustained.

“*Resolved 3d.* That ——— be expelled the Methodist Episcopal church, unless he withdraw forthwith from the Union Society, and promise not to be engaged hereafter in any publications that inveigh against our discipline or government, or speak evil of ministers;—and signify his intention so to do before the final adjournment of this conference.”

* See the whole correspondence in the Appendix, marked C.

The above conditions were not complied with, nor any other satisfaction offered.

In Mr. McCaine's case the decision was the same as in the others, except that the third specification was sustained, and that no conditions were appended to the vote of expulsion.

We will now make a few remarks on the objections which were made to the committees of trial and to the proceedings had in the premises; after which we shall give the extracts from the periodical called "Mutual Rights," upon which the charges have been sustained, and close with a few observations on the whole matter.

The protests and objections so confidently made and so pertinaciously insisted on, against the committees appointed to try the cases severally of the local preachers and the lay members, chiefly rested on the want of conformity in the appointment and in the proceedings generally, to the practice which obtains in courts of criminal jurisprudence. We may therefore entertain the hope that when these great reformers shall have remodelled the church "after their fashion," we shall, among other promised blessings, enjoy all the glorious uncertainties of the law. We shall then substitute our little book of discipline, by massy folios of common law, and statute law, with commentaries of learned length, and reports of ponderous magnitude. We shall have a goodly number of ecclesiastical lawyers—establish courts—appoint judges, with their attending clerks and other officers, who will keep us to all the rules of special pleading and legal technicalities. We may then enjoy the inestimable privilege of occasionally defeating the ends of justice, by a technical objection to an indictment, and see persons take their places in our class meetings, and at the communion, whom every body knows to be guilty of the worst offences, but who have eluded a fair trial by the subtilty of counsel. What a wonderful reformation we have in prospect, and how ardently ought it to be desired by all good methodists!!

We have heretofore considered our church judicatories as merely moral tribunals, in which a few plain, pious men were deemed capable of deciding whether an accused brother had violated his religious or social obligations, as ascertained and pointed out by the Bible and our discipline—how one found to have so offended could be reclaimed from the error of his ways—the effects of evil example prevented, and the reproach rolled away from the church of Christ. We had never thought that there was any great difficulty in such an investigation; or that the rules, by which such an inquiry was to be conducted, could be, in their nature, very obscure or complicated. The methodists had heretofore been led to think, that men of plain common sense, with the necessary piety and integrity, were

fully competent to judge in such matters both of the *law* and the *fact*. But it seems that both we and our fathers have walked in great darkness. In vain we allege, that we have hitherto lived happily under these regulations. This we are told was attributable to our ignorance—we did not know and justly estimate our privileges—all these things are now to be *reformed*.

The right to challenge jurors, it is alleged is acknowledged in all civilized and christian countries. We will not cavil at this sweeping declaration, although it might, perhaps, be shown that there are civilized and christian countries where the trial by jury does not exist at all. We admit, however, that all civilized and christian countries ought to adopt it as a civil institution of inestimable value: but it does not follow that precisely the same regulation ought to be or even can be adopted in church government, accompanied with the right to challenge jurors: and we may safely assert, that such a right, as exercised in our courts of law, does not obtain in any church judicatory of which we ever heard. In the Protestant Episcopal Church, we believe, that persons deemed unworthy are forbidden the communion, at the will of the pastor alone. In the Presbyterian Church, the trial of members accused of improper conduct, takes place before the “session,” composed of the minister and the lay-elders, all holding their office for life or during good behaviour; and deputations from the “sessions” constitute all the superior judicatories, who exercise appellate jurisdiction in the church. In the Baptist and Congregational Churches, trials for violation of discipline take place before the whole church, and we believe the accused does not possess the privilege to except against any member’s right to sit on his case. Surely it cannot be without good reason that the privilege of challenge, either peremptorily or for cause, accorded to persons indicted for offences against the laws of civil society, are not recognized in any church judicatory whatever. Why it has not been and cannot be provided for by any such explicit regulation, is indeed very obvious. It would require that there should exist somewhere in the church, an authority to compel the service of jurors and the attendance of witnesses,* and to call them from a great distance if occasion should require. But it is obvious that no church can clothe any of its officers with such powers. We readily admit, that in selecting committees, our preachers ought to set aside any man who is known to en-

* During the trials we have been giving an account of, the tribunals so far from having the power to compel the attendance of witnesses, appeared to have no authority to compel answers to interrogatories put to the witnesses who were present. Some of the officers and private members of the Union Society positively refused to say, whether the persons under trial were members of that society or not.

ertain or to have expressed any personal hostility to the accused member. We know of no instance where they have refused to do so, and were they to refuse, the quarterly meeting conference, upon an appeal, would not fail to redress the injury. In the cases under consideration, no such objection was made to any member of the committees for trial. The objections were—first, that the members of the committees of trial had, at a meeting held at Dr. Roszell's academy, participated in the appointment of a committee to prosecute—and secondly, that they had voted for certain resolutions and an address at a meeting held in the Baptist church, in Pitt street, Old Town, in which certain writers for the "Mutual Rights" and the Baltimore Union Society were called "the enemies of methodism."

To the first we may answer, that no committee was appointed at the meeting in Dr. Roszell's academy for the purpose of preferring charges against the members of the Union Society. Certain members of the church were requested to inquire into the causes which had produced the existing agitations in the church in this station. But they were left without instructions and without responsibility to the meeting, as to any measures they might be led to take in consequence of the inquiry. Many, and perhaps most of the persons at that meeting, cherished the hope that the violent measures of the Union Society would be desisted from, upon proper remonstrance with the members of that association.

The second objection is more specious, and requires particular consideration. In the address complained of, no individual is named as being responsible for the publications in the "Mutual Rights"—nor is any opinion given that the writers or publishers of that work ought to be expelled from the church. Mr. McCaine's pamphlet indeed, was alluded to, and the work as well as the motives which dictated it were spoken of in terms of very severe reprehension—but the committee appointed to try *him* were taken, two from the country and one from the East Baltimore Station, and were not at the meeting alluded to, nor in any way concerned with the address. The objection then is confined to the expression in the address as applied to the Union Society—"The enemies of methodism." Whether the voting for an address in which this was said of the Union Society, disqualified the members of the committees from serving on the trials of any member of that society, charged with inveighing or railing and evil speaking, will depend upon the import of the allegation itself—and we assert that in the only proper meaning of the expression in the address, it does not imply any offence, either against good morals, or our discipline. What is methodism? Surely it must be that which distinguishes the methodists from other denominations of chris-

tians. But what is it that distinguishes us? Certainly not our doctrines, for these are none other than those of the Church of England, and of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Mr. John Wesley and Mr. Fletcher, whose writings are the standard authorities of our church, were both ministers of the Church of England—professed entire belief in her doctrines, and appealed to her articles and homilies, as well as to the scriptures, in support of the religious tenets which they inculcated and defended. What is it then that constitutes the distinguishing appellation of “methodism?” Plainly and obviously the peculiar ecclesiastical economy of the methodists: and to be thought inimical to this economy, it was not supposed the Union Society would consider a reproach, because they had often avowed it, and certainly those who alleged it, never intended to convey the idea that those who were opposed to the leading principles of this economy, might not be good men and good christians. With “methodism,” thus defined and as thus understood by the authors of the address, the Union Society have been finding fault for the last three years, and the leaders of it for a much longer term, and it is now rather too late to deny that they are its “enemies.” That those who voted for and published the address complained of by the accused, understood the term “methodism” as we have explained it, is obvious from the address itself, for they speak of our ecclesiastical economy as “that wholesome discipline which governed our fathers and *distinguished them as a peculiar people.*” We believe also, that the Union Society have understood the term in the same sense, for we suppose that when they complain in the “Mutual Rights” of “the sovereignty of *methodism* in the south,” they do not intend to complain of the influence of the methodist doctrines, but of methodist government. It is admitted then, that those who voted for the Address of the male members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Baltimore city and East Baltimore Stations, have denominated the members of the Union Society of Baltimore, “enemies of methodism,” that is of the peculiar economy of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and they have repeatedly avowed it themselves: but in doing so the committees had not prejudged the cases of the accused on the charges now preferred against them—namely, of inveighing (i. e. railing) and evil speaking; and hence were not disqualified to try the matter at issue between the church and the accused. Whether the decision which these committees have given in the cases submitted to them, have been just, will be left to the reader, after he shall calmly and dispassionately have read the extracts from the “Mutual Rights,” upon which those who preferred the accusations relied to sustain them. For ourselves, we have no doubt that every impartial man, will, after such examination concur in the judgment of those committees.

Extracts from the periodical called "The Mutual Rights," published by an editorial committee elected annually by the Union Society of Baltimore.

Extract from the "Constitution of the Union Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the City of Baltimore."

"*Article 2.* The officers of this Society shall consist of a President, two Vice-Presidents, a Treasurer, a Secretary, a Corresponding Committee of three members, and an Editorial Committee of four ministers and four laymen, all of whom shall be elected annually by ballot."

"*Article 7.* It shall be the duty of the Editorial Committee, to inspect all original and selected matter that may be presented for publication in the 'Mutual Rights,' and to suffer no matter to be published in that work until it shall have received the approbation of a majority of said Committee;—to employ a person to print the necessary number of copies of forty octavo pages each, per month;—to solicit subscribers and patrons for the publication; and generally, to do all matters and things, which, in their opinion, are calculated to promote the circulation and usefulness of the work."—*Vol. i. pp. 20, 21.*

REMARKS.

From the above extract it will be seen, that the Editorial Committee are elected annually by the Union Society, and are consequently the agents of that Society in the publication of the periodical called the "Mutual Rights." On this principle the members of the Baltimore Union Society have been held responsible for the unfounded allegations against the characters of our ministers, and the abusive epithets so liberally bestowed upon them in that work.

Extract from "An Essay on Church Property, by the Rev. Nicholas Snethen."

"Our church property as well as power are, in effect, in the hands or under the control of the superintendents, and should the constitutional test obtain, will destroy all hopes of any legal or regular change for the better. This controlling or disposing power over public property, in men who hold an office for life, is one of the essential principles of an absolute government, and by an extension of territory, must continue to increase indefinitely. The disclaiming all right or pretension to taxation by the General Conference amounts to nothing like a check upon the power of the superintendents over property; but does in fact tend to promote it. Were it in the power of the travelling preachers, by any means, to secure an immediate support from the people, they might use the people's money to control the power of the episcopacy; but in the present state of things they

can neither occupy the houses nor receive the people's voluntary contributions, without an official signification of the executive will.

"All the travelling preachers are at the disposal of the superintendents, and so long as there shall be more preachers than there are places to support them, the surplus number must be dependent, and to make this dependence universal, no preacher has any security that his lot to '*turn out*' may not come next. It avails nothing that the public property is in the keeping of trustees or stewards. If the houses cannot be taken from the preachers, the preachers may be taken from the houses. The members of the church have in reality no church property, and the travelling preachers have none in effect. The latter are tenants at will, and at the end of each year may be removed. Are we not virtually acting over again St. Peter's patrimony and Peter pence? In monarchies public property is vested in the crown, and of course, in him who wears it; hence we hear of 'his majesty's arms and armies' and kingdom, &c.—of 'we by the grace of God'—and of 'the Pope's bull' (bulla) seal affixed to his official acts. By 'the grace of God' is meant the 'divine right,' &c."—*Ib. pp. 261, 262.*

"The hundred successors of Mr. Wesley, who compose the British conference, unite in themselves all the powers and functions that are exercised by our General Conference and superintendents. They are all bishops *de facto*. Our ordination conveys nothing which Mr. Wesley did not give to them. He was not a partial father, much less did he disinherit his first born; we congratulate our British brethren in this thing, that they have good sense enough not to run after names and shadows. There is neither divine nor human obligation binding on our General Conference to confer a life office on any man. We know to a certainty that Mr. Wesley never meant to confer any power for life upon the superintendents which he and Dr. Coke ordained, for he actually had it in contemplation to recall Mr. Asbury; of such an event Mr. Asbury was so well aware, that he took special care to prevent it, by *getting himself elected superintendent* by the American preachers."—*Ib. p. 263.*

"The consequences of exclusive proprietorship in public property in the Catholic Church is well known, and has long been seriously deplored; but it seems that we take no warning from the experience of others. We have fully set forth our determination to participate with our elder brethren in evangelizing the world. The General Conference, in their address, contemplate a meeting between the British missionaries and ours, some where on the eastern coast of Asia or Japan. But when methodism shall thus have encircled the globe, *will any regard*

be paid by the missionaries, and their senders, to the mutual rights of the ministers and the people of the Methodist Episcopal Church? No such thing. These senior and junior brethren will divide the methodist church property of the universe between them, without listening to any intimation, that the accumulation of so much wealth might seem to savor of monopoly or avarice, and might possibly be made to minister to ambition.”—*Ib.* p. 265.

“We have said that Mr. Wesley was rich in church property; and that ~~he~~ knew and felt he was so. We say the same of our superintendents, they too know and feel that they have a hold on the public property, in virtue of the absolute prerogatives of their office, sufficiently firm to enable them to dispossess *any* preacher whenever they may think proper. It is to no purpose to say, they cannot convert this property to their own private use. There is no reason to suppose they would do so, if they had the title in fee. Kings are not wont to use the property of the crown for their own private benefit, or in other words, to impoverish themselves as kings, in order to enrich themselves as individuals. It is not to be supposed, that the holders of absolute power will be less ambitious than prodigal or covetous monarchs. The glory of superintendents is proportionate to the amount of property they have in their possession. Every house that is built, and every collection that is made, adds to their consequence, by increasing their influence. *Poor bishops of rich diocesses, are not common; and poor universal bishops are much less so.* The travelling preachers also, while their imaginations are dazzled with the idea of their share in the title of property, secured by deed to the General Conference, feel rich, and look down upon the poverty of local preachers; their exclusive right to seats in the conferences, is, indeed, so flattering to their vanity, as, in most instances, to blind them to the actual state of things. Few of them can be brought to reflect steadily upon the fact, that they are little more than trustees for the bishops, who as soon as they are elected and inducted into office, are no longer responsible to them. The power or privilege of electing to an absolute office for life, is the most dangerous that can be vested in any body of men. The importance that such electors are prone to attach to themselves, is pleasantly ridiculed in the story of the cardinal and the pope. The cardinal, when he wanted a favour, reminded his holiness, that he made him pope; who, wearied at length with this importunity, replied, ‘then let me be pope.’”—*Ib.* p. 285.

“Our superintendents are not only chosen members of the conferences, and presidents for life, with the power of choosing the presiding elders, and stationing all the preachers; but

to make them as independent as possible, they are pensioners on the book fund, to the full amount of all demands. The discipline, by putting no check upon their power, presumes they can do no wrong. In one point of comparison it must be confessed, that the American itinerant preacher seems to have the advantage of the British; but another view of their condition will convince any one, that none of these seeming advantages can be realized. In England, travelling preachers who have fulfilled their probation, are eligible to the vacancies in the conference. With us, they become members of the Annual Conference, and eligible to a seat in the General Conference, and of course, nominal proprietors of the church property. Here their glory ends. Innocence or neutrality gives no security to our preachers, to an equality of appointments. Every preacher as well as the presiding elders, may become a minister to the episcopacy. Probationers may manifest greater zeal for the prerogative, than men of long standing and experience. Offences must needs come, and do often come, in despite of the greatest prudence. No travelling preacher can protect himself against episcopal suspicion, or jealousy, or displeasure, and however unjustifiable a bishop's feelings may be, he may retain them through life, and perhaps transfuse them into the breasts of his colleagues. It is possible, indeed, that they cannot all be united in a proscription; but is it not infinitely more improbable, that fifty men will withhold their votes for a presidency, year after year, from every one who will not imbibe their prejudices. The chances, therefore of being driven, or persecuted out of connexion in the two systems, bear no proportion. Though an hundred men may be as true to their common interests, as one or five, and a feeling of dependence must be engendered in both instances, yet it is of the utmost importance to weaken and conceal the feeling as much as possible.

"It is a maxim with some, and every four years of experience serves to confirm them in it, that if a preacher is not prepared to go all lengths in episcopal measures, he will do well to decline an election to a seat in the General Conference. More than one travelling preacher might, perhaps, feelingly repeat, in regard to Baltimore, with a member of the Synod of Dort: O Dort, Dort! O Baltimore, Baltimore! would to God I had never seen thee! The hero of opposition may return to his work, complacent in the consciousness of his own integrity, unawed by the fear of man; but the eye of episcopal vigilance is upon him.—His health declines, the afflictions of his family, and cares and wants multiply upon him. He needs a house at hand, for he cannot move afar off; he wants medicine, and bread! To which of the saints will he now turn, to which of his friends say, pity me, O my friends, for the hand of God

hath touched me! What! can *he* want a house, and a home, and the means of support, who inherits all houses, and property, to the exclusion of local preachers and the laity? Can a member of that General Conference, to whom so many thousands have been deeded, become a houseless wanderer, a pennyless stranger, among a strange people? Where now has the spirit of sympathy, and fellow feeling fled? O! where are his brethren, whose turn may come next! Is there no power in this heaven and earth to save him from the dread of starvation? None. How is this? Plainly thus. When all is given away, nothing remains. The General Conference have given the bishops a life power over that very property, which the donors vested in themselves. When they are made to know the worth of this property, by the want of it, at that very juncture they may be made to feel, that they can enjoy no part of it. And is there no remedy? Are bishops and presiding elders all past feeling? Perhaps there is one open door left; *what executive purpose can be so inflexible as not to relent, when executive measures have converted a poor and needy opponent.* Oh! we hope that none of these *elder brethren* will refuse to join the music and dancing, when one who was lost is thus found!"—*Ib.* pp. 286, 287.

REMARKS.

It is asserted in the above extracts, that all our church property belongs to the bishops. That Mr. Asbury "took especial good care to get himself elected superintendent by the American preachers—That the bishops are chosen members of the General Conference—That there is no check upon their power—that they are considered infallible, and finally are pensioners upon the book fund to the amount of all demands." We defy any man to find in the same number of lines, in any book in the world, which makes any pretensions to truth, as many assertions which are as entirely destitute of foundation.

1st. Our bishops have no claim, either in law or in equity, to any church property whatever. Their names do not appear in any deed by which property has been conveyed to the church, either for burying grounds, meeting houses, or parsonages. The whole body of travelling preachers, with the bishops at their head, would be legally incapable of selling, or of conveying any of this property, or of converting it to any other use, than that for which it was designed by those who purchased the ground or erected the houses, and for which it is held in trust by the trustees of the church, who are always either laymen or local preachers. The right to preach in our meeting houses is secured to the travelling preachers—but it is not in the power of the General Conference to hold or to confer on others any right of property in them.

2dly. The bishops, as such, are not members of the General Conference at all. One of the bishops presides, *ex officio*, in the conference, and has the casting vote in case the members should be equally divided upon any question before them. But this is the only participation they have in any legislative privilege in the church: and this can only be enjoyed by one of them at a time.

3dly. The bishops have no authority to draw a single dollar from the book fund on their own order, whatever their necessities may be. It is true that the family expenses of the bishops are supplied from the book fund—because as they belong to no circuit or station exclusively, they could not be supplied in any other way. But the bishops are not privileged to be “pensioners on this fund to the amount of all demands” “in order to render them as independent as possible”—On the contrary the General Conference designate a committee of travelling preachers to fix the amount which shall be allowed for the bishops’ table expenses, and the book agents cannot exceed by a single cent the amount of such allowance. So that these *independent bishops* are nevertheless dependent on the travelling preachers for bread both for themselves and their families.

4thly. It is alleged that there is no check upon the bishops’ power, and therefore it must be presumed that they “can do no wrong.” What will the reader think of this assertion, when he learns that these bishops have no power over any other persons but the travelling preachers. That these preachers delegated this power and can at any time restrict it or reclaim it to themselves, and even abolish the episcopal office, if they deem it expedient to do so. The General Conference never fail to appoint a committee on the episcopacy at every session—which committee, composed generally of one delegate from every Annual Conference, take the administration of the bishops under their consideration, and to them any complaint may be made against the episcopal administration. The bishops are not only liable to expulsion or deposition upon impeachment—but we have been again and again reminded in the “Mutual Rights” of the fact, that the conference deposed two of their bishops or superintendents, simply by leaving their names off the minutes. How then can it be alleged that there is “no check upon their power”—and that they are thought “incapable of doing wrong?” Their power we have seen is under the immediate control of those who have conferred it, and who cannot attribute infallibility where they have thought it necessary to exercise a salutary supervision, by a committee from their own body at every General Conference.

In order to show the reader the absurdity of the declaration that “the discipline by putting no check upon the power of the

bishops, presumes they can do no wrong," we will refer him to the discipline itself—page 26, questions 4th, 5th and 6th—To wit:

"*Question 4.* To whom is the bishop amenable for his conduct?

"*Answer.* To the General Conference, who have power to expel him for improper conduct, if they see it necessary.

"*Question 5.* What provision shall be made for the trial of a bishop, if he should be accused of immorality in the interval of the General Conference?

"*Answer.* If a bishop be accused of immorality, three travelling elders shall call upon him, and examine him on the subject; and if the three elders verily believe that the bishop is guilty of the crime, they shall call to their aid two presiding elders, from two districts in the neighbourhood of that where the crime was committed, each of which presiding elders shall bring with him two elders, or an elder and a deacon. The above mentioned nine persons shall form a conference, to examine into the charge brought against the bishop: and if two-thirds of them verily believe him to be guilty of the crime laid to his charge, they shall have authority to suspend the bishop till the ensuing General Conference, and the districts shall be regulated in the mean time as is provided in the third and fifth sections; but no accusation shall be received against a bishop, except it be delivered in writing, signed by those who are to prove the crime: and a copy of the accusation shall be given to the accused bishop.

"*Question 6.* If a bishop cease from travelling at large among the people, shall he still exercise his episcopal office among us in any degree?

"*Answer.* If he cease from travelling without the consent of the General Conference, he shall not thereafter exercise the episcopal office in our church."

The allegation against Mr. Asbury "*that he took special good care to get himself elected by the American preachers,*" is the "unkindest cut of all." Mr. Asbury refused to be superintendent of the Methodist Episcopal Church unless he should be elected by the free suffrages of his brethren. And was it not praise worthy to do so? He might have been superintendent by Mr. Wesley's appointment, as Dr. Coke was, (though he also was received by a vote of the conference,) but he would not exercise authority over any but those who consented to confer it upon him, and this is called "*taking special good care to GET HIMSELF elected by the American preachers.*" And this is said too by a man who in the life time of the good bishop, was his bosom friend and travelling companion, and who after his death, eulogized him in a funeral sermon in terms

of unqualified panegyrick as a "good man"—"a good minister" and a "good bishop." O shame, where is thy blush!!

In the above quotation the picture which the writer has drawn in the last paragraph, of the intolerant persecuting spirit of our bishops, can only find a parallel in the Romish inquisition. To starve the *healthy* dependent, into submission to arbitrary power would probably be considered sufficiently odious in a civilized, not to say christian community: but to deprive the sick opponent of shelter and food and medicine, until he is forced into improper compliances with episcopal prerogative is a hardness of cruelty, at which the heart sickens and at which the soul of an ordinary inquisitor would revolt. The wretch who could be guilty of such barbarity ought to be deemed to have renounced all affinity with his species, and hunted down as the common enemy of mankind. Can any man believe that such a monster is to be found among the venerable bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church? If Mr. Snethen, or the editorial committee who publish the accusation, know the man—and the facts, why not name the one, and point directly to the other. Why these cruel inuendoes, which may be ignorantly applied to the innocent. But we defy them to produce the least shadow of proof. We know the men who are thus mercilessly assailed, and the travelling preachers whose suffrages have placed them in their present parental relation to the church, know them well. Long have they laboured and suffered for the church, and endured with patience the privations to which their vocation has subjected them. Every where esteemed for their works' sake, and loved for their personal virtues, the whole community will hear with indignation the allegations of these partizans, who seem to act on the principle, that the end they have in view will justify any means they may employ to effect it. The paper in the "Mutual Rights" from which we have quoted, was published in March, 1825. At the General Conference of 1820, a motion was made and carried, to restrict the episcopal prerogative in the appointment of presiding elders. The resolutions providing for this restriction were subsequently suspended for four years, and the General Conference of 1824 continued the suspension for four years longer. Now as there were no other measures of the conference which tended to abridge the powers heretofore exercised by the episcopacy, it must be in reference to the part which the preachers who composed these conferences took in this measure, that the bishops are accused of exercising such unrelenting cruelty to those who were opposed to their prerogative—It happened however that a majority of the bishops themselves favoured the restrictive resolutions, and the rest made no opposition but on constitutional grounds: and we assert without the fear of contradiction that

no preacher has ever received less favour from the bishops on account of the part he took in relation to this question. On the contrary, we challenge a comparison of the appointments of those who favoured the restrictive resolutions with those who were opposed to them, and we pledge ourselves to shew that the best appointments have been given to those who were opposed to the episcopal prerogative. What atonement then can the author and the publishers of this cruel accusation make, to these venerable ministers of the gospel, and overseers of the flock of Christ; and to the outraged feelings of the church over which they preside, for the injury they have designed them? We leave them to answer this question at a tribunal where all our accounts will be one day finally and impartially adjusted.

It cannot be pretended that the calumny we have quoted above, is not meant to describe what has occurred, but what may be anticipated. There are in the allusions of the author, a specification of *place* and *time* and a circumstantiality of description which necessarily point out an individuality of application both as to the oppressor and the oppressed. And the sombre picture of the stern and inflexible tyranny of the episcopacy, which nothing but humble submission can appease, is only equalled by the profligacy of those "elder brethren," those panders to power and prerogative, who are represented by the author as joining the music and dancing over the converted starveling—the broken hearted victim of episcopal cruelty and oppression!!

It may be asked by the reader, how it was possible for the reverend author of the publication from which we have made the above extract, to be betrayed into such an indiscretion: as it will not be denied, that he had long been esteemed as an able minister and a pious, amiable man. The answer will afford a caution which ought to be treasured up by every christian, however high his attainments. The author was endowed by nature with genius rather than with a discriminating judgment. His fine imagination delighting to indulge in the uncontrolled exercise of its powers, despised the cold lessons of common sense and experience: but the brilliancy of his fancy, combined with a ready utterance, gave irresistible charms to his eloquence, and he necessarily became a popular preacher. Such a mind is wont to revel in mighty projects and impracticable schemes; and at the moment of penning the essays we have cited from, the author was "climbing the steep and slippery ascent to revolutionary distinction."—He was not only a partizan, but the leader of a party—and with reference to our church government and its administration, he looked upon every thing through the spectacles which party spirit had furnished him. Through this medium, every opponent and every

measure of opposition is made to take the hue, with which party feeling discolours them, and the author mistook for realities what were the mere visions of a disturbed and fervid imagination.

But what shall we say of those who published these ravings of a disordered fancy?—Who with calm deliberation laid them before the public as sober realities. Reader, are you a christian—then shun party as an evil influence which, if indulged, will inevitably destroy the spirit of love and of meekness, and substitute for them, malice and revenge, and every evil work.

Extract from the same.

“Our bishops must be flattered, or their power must be resisted. But flattery is easier and more pleasant than resistance to oppressive power. Itinerant and local preachers, and members of the church, therefore, will discover a proneness to flatter bishops. For the same reason, local preachers and members will feel disposed to flatter itinerant preachers. But can any reason be assigned, why the private members of the church should despise local preachers, or that they should manifest an indifference or aversion towards each other? Evidently, when the awe that the wealth and power of office inspires is no longer felt, or ceases to operate under the disguise of flattery, the mind experiences a re-action, and seeks to revenge itself upon the name, or form of the office, deprived of its attributes. Let the property and power which is really in our bishops, and nominally in the itinerant preachers, be transferred to the local preachers, and the public feelings will also be transferred. The flatterer pleases himself by his flattery, while he seeks to please those whom he flatters. And this pleasure proceeds from the relief which the mind experiences from the uneasy or painful sensation of fear. Mankind are sparing of their flattery towards those of whom they have nothing to hope, and from whom they have nothing to fear. The president of the United States is not flattered as a king; but would be, if his power was as much feared. We are aware, that an intimation, that our bishops and itinerant preachers are feared by the members and the local preachers, will be repelled with great indignation. Indeed, our whole theory of feeling in this case, will be considered as visionary and erroneous. Our statement is nevertheless true, and admits of the clearest demonstration. Mr. Wesley was greatly flattered, and so was Mr. Asbury. They, indeed, mistook these expressions for the marks of love, and so did those who made them; but though it is not to be doubted that there was much sincere affection, this was to the men. Their property and power were feared; and as was the fear, so was the flattery. Some of our bishops,

we perceive, will be much flattered to the south and west of the Susquehanna, and much and deservedly loved too. But it does not now seem probable, that they will receive much eulogy from the north and east. If this shall prove to be the fact, will not the limits of their praise be the limits within which their power will be feared? We beg that these remarks may be attended to, and carefully kept in mind. These are the data, on which we have predicated the separation of the north and the east, from the south and the west. Where their power is not flattered it will be resisted. This is not an unwarranted assertion; it is not a new case; it is the thing that hath already been. Leaving Mr. Wesley's name out of the minutes is a parallel instance, and may be traced to a similar cause. The absence of the man, disclosed the workings of the fear: had he been present, flattery would have concealed it all. Traces of a similar operation may be observed in Dr. Coke's visits. His power was not half so much to be dreaded as Mr. Asbury's; and yet the conference required articles to curb it, while he was in England. Of all the illusions which the human mind practises upon itself, none is more wonderful than that which takes place in the case of flattery. We always had occasion to notice, that Mr. Asbury placed his chief reliance for the ascendancy of his influence upon his presence. Where trouble was, there was he!"—*Ib.* pp. 288, 289.

REMARKS.

What a disgusting picture is here drawn of Mr. Wesley, our bishops and travelling preachers. The one catering for praise, the others fawning and cringing to power and prerogative, and flattering these tyrannical prelates as though they had places and offices of immense emolument in their gift. As Mr. Snethen travelled with Mr. Asbury, he may be allowed to know better than any body else, *what means* he himself employed to acquire the bishop's confidence and procure his favour. Whether Mr. Asbury permitted Mr. Snethen to flatter him, we cannot say; but we protest against his attributing the same disingenuous policy to the other itinerant ministers who were his cotemporaries. Some of them are yet living to feel the unkind and unwarranted accusation; and of some who are dead, we say with confidence, they were made of sterner stuff than to flatter human vanity, pride or power. That they loved and honoured Mr. Asbury is indeed very true, and never was love and reverence more justly and appropriately bestowed. But the writer says, "*We always had occasion to notice, that Mr. Asbury placed his chief reliance for the ascendancy of his influence upon his presence. Where trouble was, there was he.*" And where, we would ask, *should* the shepherd be when the flock is in danger? And if any part of the flock of Christ is in "trouble," where should he be who is appointed to watch over

the flock? We knew Mr. Asbury, and we speak advisedly when we say, "his chief reliance for the ascendancy of his influence" was placed in the singleness of heart with which he sought to promote the great interests of the Redeemer's kingdom upon earth—upon the purity and disinterestedness of his motives, which his brethren saw exemplified, in every action of his long and devoted life, and upon the blessing of the Great Head of the church, to whom he could appeal for the rectitude and sincerity of his every purpose. These, together with his acknowledged ability, gave him his great ascendancy in the councils of the church—and for the truth of this assertion, we appeal, if proof be thought necessary, to Mr. Snethen's funeral sermon on the death of this venerable servant of God.—O, PARTY SPIRIT! thou fell destroyer of peace and concord, love and union—do not the living furnish victims enough to make up the hecatombs which are to be offered upon thy altar—must thy votaries also scatter on the sacrifice the ashes of the dead!

Extract from "Nehemiah, on the Expediency of allowing to the Local Ministry and Laity a Representation in the General Conference."

"Convinced, as they [the reformers] are, that they have every thing on their side that would justify them in the sight of God, in the eyes of the world, and in the demands of their own consciences, to withdraw, is it to be expected that they will continue to submit to those who withhold their rights? To remain would be hopeless. To remain in the connexion, would be to remain to be made the butt of the contumely, and insult of every one opposed to reform. If nothing be done in favour of the reformation, it will be construed into a total defeat, and will so inflame their opponents, as to induce them to add farther injuries to the grievances already felt. What, then, can the reformers promise themselves by continuing in the connexion, in the event of a total denial of their claims? Can they promise themselves peace? Peace, they will have none. Can they hope that, by continuing to suffer, justice will be done them in the end. *Alas! injustice, like death, has neither eyes to see the miseries of its subjects, nor a heart to feel for the wounds which it inflicts.* Every symptom of patience, and every returning period, will only encourage their oppressors to be firmer in their denial, and will induce them to augment the distresses of the distressed. Can they, under this view of the subject, calculate upon the common courtesies and civilities of life? They cannot. For, even at the present, and while the cause is depending, the shafts of reproach are frequently hurled at them, even from the pulpit.

"We will now suppose that the General Conference, rigidly adhering to the present system, with all its features of injustice,

reject the petitions which may be presented for a representation. We will suppose, that those friendly to an equitable church government, based upon representation, will then proceed to take such measures as will be deemed necessary to form themselves into a church; will not many of our best and oldest local preachers be of that number? Will not many of the most intelligent and respectable laymen and their families be of the number? Will not some who are at present in the travelling connexion, and who are ground, as it were, *between the upper and nether millstones*, on account of their liberal sentiments, be of that number? We have no doubt of these things. How whole districts of country may be affected by the formation of a new connexion, we cannot tell; but, we shall neither be surprised nor mistaken in our calculation, if societies were to withdraw by scores from a church, whose ministers, if they speak the truth, would *rather see them go into sin, and finally go to hell*, than allow a representation in the law-making department of the church.”—*Ib.* pp. 478-9.

REMARKS.

We have here a plain, unequivocal developement of the ulterior views of the Union Society. They are determined to carry their measures, whether with or without the consent of the majority, or to leave the church. They call the travelling preachers “oppressors of their brethren”—and declare that these “oppressors” have neither eyes to see the “miseries” of their flock nor hearts to feel for their “wounds,” nay, that they would rather see their flocks go into “SIN” and finally into “HELL” than to accord them their rights. Gracious Heaven! are these men methodists! and are they speaking of the whole body of itinerant methodist preachers? A few indeed are excepted, who they say, however, are ground between “the upper and nether millstones, for their liberal sentiments.” If this is the language of love, what would be the language of hatred? Would a deist represent a christian ministry in more odious colours? Yet the writer of the above extracts assumes the venerated name of “NEHEMIAH.” What a pity he did not take the much more appropriate signature of “SANBALLAT.”*

Extract from a “Letter from the Baltimore Union Society to a member of the Bedford Union Society, Tennessee.”

“We have for a long time, been sufficiently well informed respecting the great dissatisfaction of many intelligent brethren, who are at the same time that they are fast friends to the doctrine of holiness, which we have received as a common legacy from the great founders of methodism, [we hope it had a higher

*Nehemiah, chap. iv.

origin,] are nevertheless unwilling to be **TRIBUTARY** to the perpetuation of a system of government which, in their opinion, is **FORGING FETTERS FOR THEMSELVES AND THEIR POSTERITY.**"—*Ib. vol. ii. p. 90.*

Extract from "An Answer to the 'Querist,' by Bartimeus."

"If they [the travelling preachers] go on, and enslave the people, the consequence will be, that they will ultimately and inevitably enslave themselves and their children after them."—*Ib. p. 37.*

Extract from a "Letter to the Editors of the Mutual Rights."

"Is it not a possible case, that some of *our rulers* may be looking forward to **AN ESTABLISHMENT**, especially as they claim a divine right to *absolute government* over those whom they have been the instruments of converting from the error of their ways; and truly, if they have this divine right, they should have it *established by law, to keep the 'restless spirits' down.*"—*Ib. p. 46.*

REMARKS.

It will be thought strange by our brethren, who are not enlightened by the "Mutual Rights," that these dark designs of our ministry should have been so long carried on without detection. *To be "forging fetters for us and our posterity," "enslaving the people" and "looking forward to an establishment,"* that is, a church established by law, by which they may *"keep the restless spirits down,"* is a terrible and treasonable conspiracy indeed. Our brethren of other denominations ought to look sharply about them, and come speedily to our assistance, lest we be all enslaved together!! We put it to the consciences of our brethren to say, whether our itinerant preachers, are such men, as would be likely to harbour such treasonable designs against the church and their country? Whether they have ever sought to exercise authority, even of a pastoral kind, over any but those who voluntarily put themselves under their care as spiritual guides? Whether with few exceptions they have not kept aloof from all political affairs—esteeming it their only business to preach a full, free and present salvation to a lost and ruined world? And whether that can be "reform" which is to be accomplished by such slander and misrepresentation as we have quoted?

Joseph Walker's Letter to the Editorial Committee.

"ALABAMA, *Dallas county, May 19, 1826.*

"DEAR BRETHREN,

"A few days ago, a friend put five or six numbers of the Mutual Rights into my hand, to read. It gave me heartfelt

satisfaction to know, that the spirit of reformation is at work in our favoured country, and especially, that it has begun in the Methodist Episcopal Church, where it is so much needed. When we look back and think of the privations, and sufferings, and fightings, through which our fathers struggled in the revolutionary war, for the attainment of civil liberty, and religious mutual rights, and then turn round and see all the principles of liberty trampled upon, by our travelling preachers, in their conferences and in their administration of church government, it is enough to grieve a heart of stone. I can but weep to see our Zion *so oppressed*. I am the son of an old patriot of the state of Pennsylvania. I have been a preacher in the Methodist Episcopal Church, more than twenty years. Have been ordained deacon and elder. My house has been all that time, a place of retreat and rest for the travelling preachers, and of constant resort for the brethren. Having, therefore, had frequent opportunities, I have intimated to bishops, presiding elders, and travelling preachers, the propriety and necessity of reform. They have commonly replied, it might be right, perhaps, and that those who wished reform, could withdraw whenever they might see proper. I was lead to pause! I pondered within myself! Oh the depth of spiritual wickedness, apparently in high places! Oh! the curse of ingratitude! Good heavens, thought I, filled with astonishment! how many hundreds of dollars, have I and many others spent, for the exclusive use of the Methodist Episcopal Church. She has been our constant care, and for her, we have laboured for twenty years and more. And never have we received one dollar of reward. Indeed, some of us, like the apostle Paul, would rather have died, than have been deprived of this our glorying in the cross of Christ. And after all, if we object to our condition of living, under continual oppression and privation, we may go out of society, in search of relief! And, if we should take them at their word and go, then our characters would be destroyed. Nothing would save us from reproach, if we cease to be called by this name.

“I was personally acquainted with bishop Asbury. I have heard him converse with the Rev. Hope Hull, who was a friend to reform. And I easily collected the information, that our church government was framed chiefly by subjects of Great Britain. Of course, I never wondered much, that such men, should have shaped their code, and made their ecclesiastical laws, according to their own model. But when I consider, that nearly all our present preachers are Americans; when I consider how excellent and powerful is the republican spirit which prevails in these United States, and how equal the civil laws under which we live. When I see how carefully our

civil and religious liberties are secured to the people of every possible variety of denomination, I am compelled to ask the question, is not the form of our church government, and the manner in which it is administered, an open insult to the constitution of the United States? It surely is, and were it fully investigated and exposed to public view, such a despotic institution would make a bad appearance before the observation of a religious republic.

“The power of the itinerancy in this part of the country, is already in a trembling condition. All that is necessary, is, for the people to be freed from the terrors of the gag-law. The people generally, think rightly, if they only dare to speak out. For my part, I was born in the year 1776, and a warm current of the blood of freemen runs through my veins. I delight to entertain a just sense of man’s equal rights in church and state. My son-in-law, Ebenezer Hern, is now, and for several years, has been a presiding elder in the Mississippi conference, and my oldest son, R. L. Walker, is a travelling preacher in the same conference. These facts serve with other considerations, as you may suppose, to make me more solicitous for a change in our church government. For I do not wish to see any of my family, have a part in holding the reins of a government, which is administered in unrighteousness.

“There are many things, which I would be glad to communicate. But I am aware that my zeal in so good a cause, after having been so long suppressed, may be in danger of rising too high. I must therefore come to a close.

“I send you ten dollars. You will be so good as to send me one copy of your first volume; if convenient, send it bound. Also, six copies of your second volume. I have procured no subscribers for them as yet, but I will see to it, that they shall be well circulated.

“Any use you may think fit to make of these my remarks, will have my approbation. I try to live before God, independent of the frowns or smiles of men. My name is Joseph Walker, my place of residence is Dallas county, state of Alabama.

“I will conclude with saying, that in the whole extent of my reading, in ancient or modern history, I have not met with any notice of a single order of people, except the Roman Catholics and Methodists, whose preachers convene without the consent of the people, make laws for the government of the people, and afterwards, turn round and execute those laws. I have been wide awake to the cause of reform, fifteen years or more. But the subject not being popular, I have been compelled to speak of it only in confidence. Men of the best minds in our itinerancy are of the same opinion. How can it be otherwise?

But supremacy and self-preservation, keep most of them silent. Let us be of good courage, for we have nothing to fear. Let us be faithful to God, and the cause of equal rights and the world will be secured without firing a gun, or shedding of blood."—*Ib.* pp. 26, 27, 28.

Extracts from "Luther on Representation."

"MESSRS. EDITORS,

"With much interest I have perused several numbers of your Mutual Rights. The friends of reform speak very intelligibly, the language of the American family. They reiterate the theme of those who gloriously repose in the stillness of Thermopylæ, Marathon, Charonea, Pharsalia, Monmouth. They resist the same principle which slew the martyrs, slaughtered Poland, assailed America, and was vanquished. That principle is despotism. At this plain word some will cry out, treason; or, what is tantamount, apostacy. Oh, Messrs. Editors! how profoundly I regret, that truth will apply this hateful characteristic to any part of methodistical polity; the searcher of hearts alone can tell. For sixteen years have the sympathies of my heart, and the energies of my mind (such as they be) been deeply interested in behalf of your Zion. During that time, I have lingered, with fond solicitude about your outer courts, (not having shared in her councils, though of her priesthood;) I have willingly hewn her wood and drawn her water; all the while hoping, that her leading chieftains would roll away this reproach from her honour, banish this cloud from her beauty, purge this poison from her vitals, dig this volcano from her foundations, and enable her to walk forth in all her native beauty, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners; the praise of the whole earth. Until the last General Conference, I viewed this despotic trait in her polity, as the offspring of casualties; a sort of wild exotic, which by some mishap had sprung up in the garden of the Lord: *a wandering demon*, which had insinuated himself into our paradise, unobserved; and like Milton's toad at the ear of Eve, infused into the genius of our church, portentous dreams and dreary visions. I looked to that General Conference for an achievement worthy of primitive christianity and American methodists. My fond imagination displayed to my view, an august assembly of holy men, hurling this monster from the heights of their Salem, a spectacle to an admiring nation. But oh! cruel disappointment, methodism has lost one of her richest laurels: never did an epoch of her history give to her rulers, so distinguished an opportunity of shedding an immortal lustre upon her own name and their own memories. But that circular, the ominous offspring of her labour, too barren to merit criticism, serves only to mortify the

best friends of methodism, and to legalize oppression."—*Ib.* pp. 53, 54.

"But when those representatives of the itinerancy, who alone elect them, presume to legislate for all the locality and laity of the methodist church, what assumption can be more unwarrantable! what system more oppressive? In case of grievance, where shall the locality and laity look for redress? They have no check upon their lawgivers. The members of the General Conference are all pledged to their itinerant brethren who sent them there; and the itinerancy in mass are all indirectly pledged to the episcopacy: hence the episcopacy is frequently strengthened and the itinerancy is always guarded; but the rights of the laity and locality are trampled on."—*Ib.* pp. 55, 56.

"Oh! is the religion of Jesus with all its enrapturing joys, the soul with all its indescribable powers, heaven with all its inconceivable glories, and hell with all its unutterable horrors; are these matters so trivial, that we leave them to the winds, to the speculations of self-created conclaves, while we guard the sanctuary of our civil, our momentary rights so inviolably? Illustrious prophets and martyrs, had you been thus pliant, instead of sailing through the bloody storms of time to endless rest, you had smoothly glided down to hell; instead of leaving your track to glory a living galaxy of heavenly light, the heavy clouds of the second death would now fling their thunders upon your weather-beaten spirits; instead of handing down to posterity the word of life, pure and undefiled, you had bequeathed to the world a darkness more dreary than that which fell on ancient Egypt. But, ye reverend spirits of Europe and Asia, you have fought the good fight, and laid hold upon the crown of life. It is for us American methodists, to prostrate ourselves at the foot of a spiritual aristocracy, and say, let us eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel; but let us be called by your name. It is for us to cower at the foot of that principle in ecclesiastics, which was chastized by our forefathers upon the agents of a civil despot. It is for us methodists to take the humiliating responsibility, of shamelessly encouraging a spiritual domination, in the face of free America. It is for us, the emancipated sons of conquering chieftains, to rivet those chains upon our descendants, which were torn from our hands, if we only give them the name of religion."—*Ib.* pp. 56, 57.

"But Messrs. Editors, valuable as your paper is, the friends of reform must appeal to the public through other mediums in union with that. You encounter a well organized, artful, enterprising opposition, which spreads through almost every city, village, and neighbourhood, from Maine to Georgia. Their first effort is to conceal to the utmost the disquietudes and grievances which exist in our church, and to lull a spirit of inquiry to rest.

Where this is impracticable, they arraign the motives of the reformers with uncharitable, with uncivil severity. Your own paper, if I have not been sadly misinformed, having been branded as a sort of libel upon the church, published by desperate designers, has been kept out of the hands of valuable men to whom it was addressed, and left to linger in post offices. Oh! how I regret to know the men, and the character they sustain in society, who are employed in this *midnight stabbing*. Could I believe in transmigration, I might imagine that some of the Jesuits expelled from Europe, had taken up their residence in the bodies of some I..... [Itinerants] in the United States. Parsimony is a strong hold, to which very successful appeals are made. The local reformers want salaries, city settlements, &c. &c., and the great men (in common style) want to send the little men home, who serve cheaply, &c. To the last of these charges I plead guilty with all my heart, for I have long believed, that if the church could exercise the right of suffrage, she would sift the talents of her ministry, and secure the best for her service. But the fallacy of the other subterfuges of the anti-reformers, bears its own characteristic. The majority of suffrages will always be among the laity, they will therefore have it in their power to check abuses, and under a well balanced form of government, those presumers who grasp so greedily after power, would sink into merited contempt, while modest worth would be duly promoted. I say you must appeal to the public through other mediums; you have past the Rubicon, there is no returning without a sacrifice of principle, without abandoning your church to her degraded destiny. If you suffer another General Conference to legislate for you, I am ready to say, prepare for tame submission or banishment. Your missionaries should now be on the highways of the nation, and in the pulpits of your church; and the friends of reform should send their private communications every where. You have the prejudices of many years arrayed against you, and that still inglorious repose, which undisturbed power, *artfully administered*, gives, refuses to part with its slumbers.”—*Ib.* pp. 58, 59.

“Those who are now securely enthroned on the summit of the cloudy Olympus of power, when they shall feel the mount quake and tremble beneath them, will become solicitous to know what is the matter, and not before.”—*Ib.* p. 62.

REMARKS.

We learn from this writer, that the Methodist Episcopal Church is such a despotism as was resisted by the Greeks and Romans, and by the Americans at Monmouth—that it is predicated on the same principles as that which “slaughtered Poland” and “slew the martyrs”—that it is an “*assumption of authority*” that is an *usurpation*—nay, an “unwarrantable and

oppressive assumption," and the "rights of the laity and locality are trampled on"—our conferences are "self-created conclaves"—that if the prophets and martyrs had been as pliant as we methodists, they "had smoothly glided down to HELL," and "the heavy clouds of the second death would now fling their thunders upon their weather beaten spirits;" but they fought through "bloody storms" and escaped, while we stupid, cowering, insensible methodists run the risk of "hell" and the "heavy clouds," nay, the "thunders of the second death," rather than prevent all these terrible calamities, *by sending the writer and a few more of his radical local brethren to the General Conference.* Instead of this, he says, "we prostrate ourselves at the foot of a SPIRITUAL ARISTOCRACY," and "shamelessly encourage A SPIRITUAL DOMINATION." These violent denunciations and invectives might have been taken for the ravings of a madman, had they been published by himself; and the author would have been considered rather as a subject for an hospital than an object of reproof or punishment. But they have been adopted by the editorial committee of the Union Society, and given to the world as the sentiments of reformers!! The communication is dated North Carolina, May, 1825, and if we have not mistaken the author, the publication, had it come out under no other sanction than his own proper name, would have been a very harmless thing indeed. These "midnight stabbing" "itinerants," into whose bodies (could he believe in transmigration) he should imagine the jesuits had entered, can only feel these cruel aspersions when they are authorised by men of standing and character; such as conducted the work in which they have been published. We ask the editorial committee then, can *they* be "aristocrats" who have been recommended by the laity and received by the ministry, and who hold their offices during good behaviour? If the tenure of their offices constitute them aristocrats, then are all the civil judges of our land aristocrats. Can *they* be despots and oppressors, whose authority no man is bound to obey a moment longer than he pleases; who exercise no power over any but those who voluntarily entrusted them with it: and who subsist upon the voluntary bounty of those they govern. Our ministers themselves have taught us to esteem them only as the servants, not the lords of the church; watching over the flock of the great Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, as they who must give an account to God. Such we still esteem them, and shall persist, notwithstanding what the Union Society have said of them, to love and honour them greatly for their works' sake; at least so long as they shall continue to be as they have heretofore been, examples to the flock of Christ.

As to the letter of Mr. Joseph Walker, we deem it unnecessary to comment upon it. As the impotent rage of perhaps a valetudinary, and certainly of an angry man, it can only derive importance from the sanction which the Union Society have given to the abuse which he so liberally bestows on the itinerant preachers. If Mr. Walker's manners are not better, he has certainly more *honesty* than Luther, for he gives his name. The Union Society have recognized them both as partizans, and are justly chargeable with a participation in the calumny and evil speaking which abounds in both of the communications.

Extracts from "Timothy's Address to the Junior Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church."

"I think it is pretty clear from Moore's life of Mr. Wesley, that Dr. Coke exceeded his authority in the affair of a third ordination, and in taking to himself and Mr. Asbury, the name of bishop. The forming a church government which gives all ecclesiastical *power* to the *ministry* was a *bold step*. But bishops stop not here; the creation of presiding elders, who are the *special agents of the bishops*, has given them a degree of *power*, over the *whole church*, which really looks *alarming*. And now, four of our bishops divide the whole work, of these United States, between them; and our *senior bishop is arched over the whole*. What does this look like? In fifty years, power has marched farther in the Methodist Episcopal Church, than it did in the three first centuries of the primitive church; and yet with all these facts before you, the people are admonished to abstain from reading the Mutual Rights, and to let such investigations alone!—GOD FORBID!"—*Vol. iii. p. 112.*

"We should be more inexcusable, than the members of the christian church, in the rise of popery, if we were to suffer our spiritual rulers to enslave us; we have many advantages unknown to them, particularly the printing press; what a blessing this has been to the world; what a scourge to wild and lawless ambition!"—*Ib.*

"To me it does appear to be a duty, which we owe to the glorious Author of our holy religion, to our fellow christians, and to posterity, to discuss this subject before the whole church; that the slumbering sons of our Zion may be roused, and kept awake, with an attentive eye fixed ON THE STEALING MARCH OF ECCLESIASTICAL POWER. We have seen what the christian church was in its origin, we have seen what it *grew to*, in process of time. The people trusted too much to the goodness and infallibility of the ministry; and the preachers seeing this, took advantage of it, and went on increasing their own power, until the church was ruined. Let the Methodist Episcopal

Church take warning. The wreck of one fallen church now covers the world, and what has happened to the Church of Rome, may happen to us, if we are not *careful, vigilant, prayerful and resolute.*"—*Ib.* p. 113.

"Is even sober inquiry on the part of our people so *terrifying* to our junior bishop? O my dear sir, let your present *palpitations* teach you, if *nothing else will*, that all is not right in our church government, and that to assuage your *fears*, you must lessen your *power*; nothing is more *alarming* to men in your *situation*, than *even a just re-action of public feeling*. Still you oppose the Mutual Rights for fear of agitating our people; did *Luther and Calvin and Zuingle and their coadjutors feel the force of this argument?* Did they abandon their holy enterprise, for fear of disturbing his holiness, in *St. Peter's chair*, for fear of agitating the Church of Rome? No verily they did not; nor will we.

"I am inclined to think that no branch of the christian church has, for several centuries, been in such a *dilemma* as ours. We are in a *strait betwixt two*. Between '*agitating*' the church, on the one hand, (*if calm discussion will agitate it*) and the *bold march of ecclesiastical power*, on the other. If we let *power* march on, the church is ruined. If we attempt by our *investigations to arrest it in its course*, the church it seems will be '*agitated*.' Under a conviction, that there is some analogy between the natural and moral world; that as the ebbing and flowing of the tide, has a tendency to purify the ocean; and that thunder storms tend to purify the atmosphere, which surrounds our earth; so also, does the agitating of the great political, ecclesiastical, philosophical, and religious questions, by which the attention of the community has now and then been arrested, tend, more or less, to *political ecclesiastical, philosophical, and moral purity*. Under a conviction of *these things*, I have been led to adopt my present course, with a fixed determination, to be *troublesome to lovers of power and prerogative, so long as I live.*"—*Ib.* p. 114.

"As to your advice to 'be still and say nothing, until we stand on the floor of the General Conference,' I can only say, that the delegates for that body are yet unknown, and perhaps arrangements may be made by '*caucusing*' or otherwise, to leave reformers all at home. (The like has been heard of.*)" In such an event, are we to be kept out of General Conference by *stratagem*, and forced into silence too? This will be very hard indeed; a few such attempts have been made. They succeeded, and *a few more* will make a *new church*. Brethren ought to be above *stratagem*, when they elect their delegates; surely,

* Witness the Baltimore Conference at Winchester, 1924.

we are *far gone* after the *mother of harlots*, when we can practice *pious frauds*! Every honest man should abandon the church, as he would abandon a sinking ship, so soon as she determines on carrying her measures by trick, stratagem or pious fraud. It is to be hoped, the episcopacy will have nothing to do with these things. If they do, I here advertise them, that *they*, and not the *reformers*, must bear the blame, if commotions shall *ensue*.”—*Ib.* p. 116.

“‘The bishop has some fears for his power, or why all this exertion against reform. Bishop and travelling preachers, have all the power in the government of our Zion, and this address plainly says, that by the grace of God or otherwise, they mean to keep it; a love of power always marches onward, crying give! give! And men of great prerogatives are rarely known to yield them, in order to secure the general welfare.’ In short, sir, your hand seemed to be against every man whose hand might be against the episcopal and ministerial power of our church. You took your stand against all who would ask you for Christ’s sake, for the church’s sake, for peace sake, to let some of your ecclesiastical power fall into other hands.”—*Ib.* p. 117.

REMARKS.

This writer would really alarm us, if we could bring ourselves to believe all his forebodings. But as we know his premises are false, we cannot doubt the fallacy of his conclusions. “And now four of our bishops,” he says, “divide the whole work, of these United States, between them, *and our senior bishop is arched over the whole. What does this look like?*” Why really it looks very like an arch-bishopric; and from this the author naturally comes to the conclusion that “in fifty years power has marched farther in the Methodist Episcopal Church than it did in the three first centuries of the primitive church!!” Mr. McKendree is then an archbishop! We were not prepared for this. We had considered Mr. McKendree as superannuated, and as having for some years declined the arduous duties of the episcopacy. Devoting indeed his remaining strength to the cause to which he has consecrated his youth and his riper years—but leaving the administration of the government almost wholly in the hands of his junior associates in the episcopal office. We believe moreover that this exemption from the burden and cares of office were asked and obtained from the General Conference: and now he is to be accused of usurping an archiepiscopal authority!! The grey hairs of this veteran, ought to have saved him this taunting appellation. His faithful labours—his devoted life—his long and invaluable services to the church, and even his many infirmities ought to have shielded him from this biting sarcasm—this unfeeling insult. The author well knew that

there existed no legal superiority among the bishops—whatever preference might be accorded by the juniors, to the age and experience of the elder incumbent of the episcopal office. Doctor Jennings, in his defence “INTENDED TO HAVE BEEN DELIVERED” before the District Conference—rings the changes on the circumstance of his being an “aged minister.” How much did he respect the feelings of aged ministers when he inserted in his periodical this bitter phillipic against this good old man—this aged, venerable minister of the Lord Jesus Christ? But the doctor was *reforming the church*, “after his fashion,” and the bishop, as well as most if not all the senior itinerant ministers, stood in his way, and he could not therefore consent to spare them.

There does not appear, even from the writer’s own showing, that there was any thing amiss in the junior bishop’s valedictory address to the Pittsburg Conference. There was an exhortation to peace and concord—a wish expressed that the preachers should avoid agitating the church, by discussing amongst the members the subject of changing our form of government, and this we presume applied as well to those who were opposed to the change as to those who were in favour of it. The bishop no doubt thought that the preachers might lessen their usefulness, if they enlisted themselves as partizans in this dispute, which has already excited too much feeling; and he very properly advised them to postpone the discussion, until by themselves or their representatives, they should have an opportunity calmly and deliberately to consider it on the floor of the General Conference; where only it could be determined. He further advised them not to aid in the circulation of the “Mutual Rights,” and we think the extracts from that work which we have given fully justify the advice of the bishop. He could not believe that a methodist preacher ought to give countenance or currency to a work, in which his brethren and fellow labourers are calumniated and abused. From this advice, however, the most unwarrantable inferences are drawn as to the bishop’s motives and principles. The writer ascribes to him a thirst for power and desire of domination, which is only equalled by the papacy. “We should be more inexcusable,” says he, “than the members of the christian church in the rise of popery, if we were to suffer *our spiritual rulers to enslave us*; we have many advantages unknown to them, particularly the printing press; what a blessing this has been to the world, *what a scourge to wild and lawless ambition*.”—Page 112, vol. iii. He advises us to “keep an attentive eye *on the stealing march of ecclesiastical power*.” And he intimates an apprehension lest what has happened to the Church of Rome may happen to us. He infers from the bishop’s address, without any reason

whatever, that he is an enemy to religious liberty. The address he supposes meant that, "to *obey* was enough for the people." Bishops govern in all the plentitude of their power by "a divine right, which ought not to be examined or called in question." And he proposes to hold Mr. Hedding up to the political execration of the people—for he says, "I do, sir, think it my duty, to hold your conduct up to public view, *that all men may know, what a genuine friend to the rights of man you are; and how entirely republicanism governs all your movements.*" Now would not any man infer from all this vituperation and abuse, that the bishop had greatly infringed upon the author's rights, or uttered some opinions on the subject of government subversive of our civil institutions? Yet nothing of this had happened. He had only dissuaded the preachers from aiding the circulation of a slanderous publication, and exhorted them to such conduct, as he thought necessary to preserve them in the unity of the spirit and the bond of peace.

As to the "*stealing march of ecclesiastical power*" which is complained of, the writer knew that the march had been retrograde. The ministry have much less power than formerly; and the lessening this power was the voluntary act of the ministry. They once expelled members from the church at will, and appointed stewards and made preachers, without any reference to the people—none of these powers now remain with the preachers; and as to the superintendents, they have less power now than Mr. Wesley's general assistant had before the revolutionary war. That is, than Mr. Asbury had before he was made bishop—for then he dismissed preachers from the travelling connexion whenever he thought it proper or necessary. What bishop has any such power now? In fact they have no power, but that of making the preacher's appointments, that is of distributing the labourers as the state of the vineyard may require; and this they do by the authority of the preachers themselves. All this was known, we suppose, to the editorial committee of the Union Society—for we would not suppose them ignorant of their discipline and the history of their church. We infer then that they published this writer's remarks knowing that they were unfounded. Yet they allege "they have not been charged with any immorality!!" They must excuse us if we entertain a different opinion.

We have heard that the writer (Timothy) who is a member of the Pittsburg Conference, made some explanations or apologies to his brethren in conference, which were accepted. This however makes no atonement for the offence of those who published his remarks—they have offered no apology for their participation in the affair.

Extracts from "Miscellaneous Remarks by Dissenter."

"I confess it is a source of peculiar gratification to me, to see the spirit of determined inquiry so extensively diffused among our people, notwithstanding conference lectures, pulpit hints, and class-room lessons to prevent it. These warning voices so often lifted up in our hearing, are the evident misgivings of power, and so many proofs that our arguments in favour of reform, are felt even by those who affect to despise them. A fourth of my prefatory remarks was, that although much good feeling may be lost in this controversy, yet as the present and future interests of the church require it, reformers ought not to blench from their purpose, whatever *social* sacrifices they may be called upon to make; but ought to continue in the church, and multiply and vary their efforts, until the existing anomaly of government in the Methodist Episcopal Church, shall revert to its primitive Wesleyan standard; in which state, if we can credit Mr. Wesley's declarations, it was never intended that the methodists should become an ecclesiastical establishment, headed by an episcopal hierarchy, consisting of an indefinite number of incumbents, all possessing the same powers, and ruling the same diocese. The model for such a state of things, is not to be met with in the whole range of church history, *except when four individuals at the same time, claimed by divine right, the chair of popedom in the Roman see.* If the reader is startled at this, let him recollect that things that are alike in their nature and progress will be compared by the human mind, and classed accordingly."—*Ib.* p. 148, 149.

"We cannot expect to succeed immediately in the great objects we have in view. I have no hope that the next General Conference will do any thing for us. *We have too many men in power, bishops and would-be-bishops, that are hovering over the nucleus of ecclesiastical aggrandizement;* and already laying their plans to prevent the election of reformers to the General Conference, to indulge the hope, even for a moment, that we shall be able to accomplish much in any short time. But the fact, that they are thus industrious to defeat the objects of reform, is the proof of our success. *Let them manœuvre, let them caucus, let them buy men by the "sale of indulgences,"* all will ultimately operate in our favour, and only multiply our friends."—*Ib.* p. 149.

"But Mr. Wesley seems not to have contemplated an episcopacy in any shape. It is, to be sure, asserted in the preface to our book of discipline; but the oldest preachers in the United States, with whom I have conversed and corresponded on this subject, never saw the warrant. It has been called for by friends and foes for thirty years, but is not yet forthcoming.

If such warrant exists, why is it that we can learn nothing about it?"—*Ib.* p. 152.

"But until such document or warrant from Mr. Wesley, be produced, *I as an individual, must of necessity continue to doubt the historical probity of the preface to our book of discipline*, in relation to this particular."—*Ib.*

"What had Wesleyan methodism to do with our self-created and self-styled episcopacy? For I repeat it, Dr. Coke was only set apart as a superintendent of the American methodists, and not ordained to a third office as a prelatical bishop. The ceremony of separation was only intended to confer Mr. Wesley's authority to oversee the American methodists upon another, as Mr. Wesley could not attend to them in person. What did original methodism know of our order of presiding elders? One man having power to appoint seventy; to overrule and remove at pleasure fourteen hundred. Where in the annals of original methodism did the framers of our discipline meet with the ceremony of ordination for a bishop."—*Ib.* p. 153.

"The improvements proposed in our present form of government, are openly denounced as 'innovations.' This is somewhat singular when every man of information knows, that our whole system of episcopacy in the United States, is to all intents and purposes, an 'innovation' upon the genius and plans of Wesleyan methodism, and one expressly disapproved and disavowed by Mr. Wesley."—*Ib.* p. 154.

Extract from "An Appeal to the Good Sense of the Citizens of the United States, by Rev. Asa Shinn."

"P. S.—If the Baltimore brethren think me visionary, in supposing the reformers will finally be successful, let me explain myself: I do not think any *sudden* reformation either practicable or desirable; but that the cause will advance *gradually* and *surely*. Do I suppose this will be done without opposition? Far from it: I believe the powers that be, 'from the episcopal chair, down to the foundling's stool,' will strain every nerve to crush us: that the reformers will have to advance like men struggling against wind and tide—against rain and snow, and hail, and thunder, and lightning. The minds of many, I expect will storm and rage, as though they really believed we intended to pull down the moon—or as though they thought our success would destroy *morality, civilization, methodism and christianity!* And all this will be nothing more nor less, than an anxious, trembling effort, to support the wonderful sacredness of *human authority!* The world has been so long befooled with delusion, that many appear disposed to act as though they believed, that, if it were not for the great prop of human authority, it would be doubtful whether

Almighty God would be able to take care of the christian world."—*Ib.* p. 212.

Extract from "Presbyter to the Editors of the Mutual Rights."

"Now the object of these remarks, Messrs. Editors, is to show that our episcopacy has nothing to do with original Wesleyan methodism, and is disowned by it. It cannot, therefore, be in any way essential to our prosperity, for the history of the British methodists, and that of the American methodists for eighteen years, proves clearly and indubitably that its alleged importance in order to the success of christianity among us, is a perfectly gratuitous assumption, unsupported by reason, history, or common sense. On the other hand, if our bishops, and their pertinacious supporters as high-toned episcopalians, ill as it may look, (for such they really are,) would yield and distribute throughout the different departments of the church that part of their power, that has come into their hands 'SURREPTIOUSLY,' it would abate the honest inquietude of thousands; it would remove the just apprehensions of the discerning, and bring worthy multitudes into the bosom of the Methodist Church, whose names, as things now are, will never adorn our calendar. Of the truth of these remarks, I have no doubt, and surely one who has travelled as a Methodist itinerant preacher, at least fifty thousand miles, may be permitted to speak on a subject that lies so near his heart, and is vitally connected with the individual and social interest of living and unborn millions! With these remarks, Messrs. Editors, I close; but as I have passed the Rubicon, you may hear from me again about the ides of March."—*Ib.* p. 232.

Extracts from "Reasons in plea for reform, in the government of the Methodist Episcopal Church, by Neale."

"4th. From the preceding facts, it appears, that the introduction of episcopacy among the Methodists in the United States, so far from being 'recommended' by Mr. Wesley, was expressly disapproved and forbidden, and the proceedings of the General Conference of 1784, in establishing *diocesan* episcopacy among us, was in open violation of the instructions of Mr. Wesley; and, I now take the liberty of saying, to the Rev. Wm. McKendree, Enoch George, Robert R. Roberts, Joshua Soule, and Elijah Hedding, that a statement on this subject, to which I find their names subscribed, in the preface to our book of discipline, is believed by *many* TO BE A PERVERSION OF HISTORICAL FACT, and they are hereby publicly called upon, to furnish some *evidence* of the truth of the aforesaid statement; or leave us to infer, that such evidence cannot be produced. In justice, however, to these distinguished individuals in the Methodist

Episcopal Church, I would say distinctly, I believe they are all innocent of having made this statement originally, but they have made it their *own*, by giving it the sanction of their names, as I have not been able to learn, that this preface has ever been sanctioned by any General Conference, if it *has*, upon learning it, I shall make (should God preserve my life) a similar call on the next General Conference, as the proper organ of information, at present the bishops appear to be the *only* responsible persons, and on *them I call*. Should the policy of the cabinet induce them to remain silent, as heretofore on similar occasions, I shall take the liberty of thinking they cannot answer me, without damage to their own cause, which it would seem must be supported by *silence*. 5th. As it is in proof before the reader, that methodist episcopacy can derive no support from the *name* or *sanction* of Mr. Wesley, *both* having been *definitely* withheld, so also, does it admit of proof, that the great body of the methodist ministers and members in the United States were not *consulted* at all, in the adoption of this enormously mis-shapen system of aristocratic government. It was the *undivulged* project, the favourite scheme of a few master spirits, who meeting in secret conclave, and excluding the junior members even of their own body, (as living witnesses declare) acknowledging no constitutional rights, and comprehending no legislative privileges, as belonging to any except themselves, proceeded to the *hasty* formation of the present plan of government among us, and *unblushingly palmed it upon posterity, as the offspring of Mr. Wesley's wisdom and experience*. 6th. The spurious origin of methodist episcopacy, is to be inferred from the fact, that those very individuals who made these pretensions, were unsettled and felt *misgivings* on the subject.

"Dr. Coke in a letter to bishop White, of Philadelphia, *doubts* the power of Mr. Wesley to confer legitimate episcopal authority; he does the same in a letter to the bishop of London, written subsequently, in both of which he *modestly* asks for re-ordination."—*Ib.* pp. 310, 311.

"In the present preface to our book of discipline, the adoption of our present form of government is attributed to the express instructions of Mr. Wesley; but the venerable Wesley has, unequivocally, *disavowed* the honour, and no one has ever shown or quoted the document, paper, or verbal instructions of Mr. Wesley. It is now nearly a year, since all our bishops were *respectfully* invited to furnish information on this subject, if they had any to furnish, they have not even deigned a reply of any kind, passing by the *uncourteousness* of such an act, and the insult it offers to the wishes of inquiring thousands, who it is *known* to the bishops, feel a deep interest in the subject, I shall plead their apology, by taking it for granted, that they

would have replied, if they had been able to do so, without *defacing* the beauty of those 'institutions received from their fathers,' many of whom are *still living*; or, perhaps, like the Chinese historians; they are unacquainted with their own *origin* because their *living* fathers *conceal it*.

"But finally, Mr. Asbury pleads his authority, as a methodist bishop, on the following grounds: '1st. Divine authority. 2d. Seniority in America. 3d. Election of the General Conference, 1784. 4th. Ordination of Coke, Otterbine, Whatcoat, and Vasey. 5th. Because the signs of an apostle were found in him.' See Asbury's Journal for May, 1805, 3 vol. page 168. No 'succession' directly hinted at here, no allusion to Mr. Wesley. On this *expose* of the *arcana* of methodist episcopacy, I would only say it is plain, Mr. Asbury is here speaking of himself as a bishop of the third order, and superior to presbyters. Of his 'Divine authority' we can say nothing, only we know it was not received from the scriptures. As to 'seniority' we have yet to learn that it ever creates any *new* civil or religious rights. With regard to the vote of the 'General Conference' electing Mr. Asbury, it is only necessary to observe, they might have acted unadvisedly in this vote of the conference of 1784, as well as in others, and we know that *many* of the acts of that very conference, have been since *repealed*, as improper and disadvantageous. On the subject of 'ordination' as it was only an ordination by presbyters, we cannot admit its 'episcopal validity,' if more be meant than a presbyter. As it respects the last item, the signs of an apostle, can only be seen *in an apostle*, and of course have not been seen *since* the apostolic age. Thus the reader will perceive that our 'fathers' acted a palpably inconsistent part, in the introduction of episcopacy among us, and have been under the necessity (created by their own indiscretion) of acting an equally awkward, and I fear, posterity will think, ridiculous part, in defending themselves against the charge, of a RECKLESS USURPATION OF UNWARRANTED POWER." —*Ib.* pp. 312, 313.

REMARKS.

The first remark we have to make upon the preceding quotations is, that the studied endeavour of the Union Society of Baltimore, to make the reformers elsewhere believe that they did not sanction Mr. McCaine's "History and Mystery," is frustrated by the obvious coincidence between the assertions in their own publications and Mr. McCaine's pamphlet. Much as we disapprove Mr. McCaine's conduct, we do not think he has been well used by his brethren of the Union Society. Since the masterly refutation of all the allegations in the "History and mystery," by Dr. Emory, in his able "Defence of our Fathers," the members of the Union Society not only deny

their having recommended the publication, but have almost wholly ceased to defend it. Now, although for reasons heretofore given, they did not vote as a society to recommend it, yet there can be no doubt of their having generally encouraged him to publish the work; and we have seen that they reiterated most of his opinions and unfounded assertions in the "Mutual Rights." To leave him now to bear alone the obloquy and disgrace he has incurred in the common cause, is neither fair nor honourable, and the stratagem is as hopeless as it is unfair. The copartnership is obvious, and the *mutual rights* and mutual responsibilities will be ascertained and adjudged accordingly by the public.

In the quotations from the "Mutual Rights" which we have selected, the reader will find it expressly asserted, that "Mr. Wesley does not seem to have contemplated an episcopacy in any shape. It is to be sure asserted in the preface to our book of discipline; but the oldest preachers in the United States, with whom I have conversed and corresponded on this subject, never saw the warrant." They had seen, nevertheless, Mr. Wesley's letter of ordination to Dr. Coke. "But until such document or warrant from Mr. Wesley be produced, I, as an individual, must of necessity continue to doubt *the historical probity* of the preface to our book of discipline in this particular"—and "Neale" says of our episcopal government, that this "enormously misshapen system of aristocratical government was the *undivulged* project, the favourite scheme of a *few master spirits, who meeting in secret conclave*, and excluding the junior members even of their own body (as living witnesses declare) acknowledging no constitutional rights, and comprehending no legislative privileges, as belonging to any except themselves, proceeded to the *hasty* formation of the present plan of government amongst us, and *unblushingly palmed it upon posterity as the offspring of Mr. Wesley's wisdom and experience*." Again, its origin is termed "*spurious*" and "*sur-reptitious*," and it is said, that those who made it "were *unsettled* and felt misgivings on the subject." Wicked, it seems, they were, and wicked enough to palm a falsehood upon their brethren and upon posterity, though they were not past all feeling—not quite reprobate—for they had some qualms of conscience about it. The Machievalian policy, however, prevailed, and they have continued to republish this falsehood in every succeeding edition of the discipline down to the present time. The present bishops have moreover made this wickedness "their own, by giving it the sanction of their names." But this is not all. To perpetuate this shameless imposition, these bishops are represented as "*caucusing*," "*manœuvring*," and "*buying men by the sale of indulgences*," all

over the United States. The "sale of indulgences" being one of the many evil practices charged upon the Church of Rome, has a specific meaning; but if we are startled at this, as well as other identifications with the Romish hierarchy, even at the darkest period of her history, we are reminded that "things that are alike in their *nature* and *progress*, will be compared by the human mind and classed accordingly."

We do not propose to enter upon a regular defence of our fathers. That has been already done, in the answer to Mr. McCaine, which we have just alluded to. But we would ask, what has Mr. McCaine alleged against Mr. Asbury and Dr. Coke, together with the conference of 1784, which is not in substance repeated in these extracts. Most of the worthies of that conference have fallen asleep in Jesus; they are enjoying the reward of their labours, where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest. Some of their cotemporaries still live, to edify the church by their ministry and by their holy example. The surviving veterans who were in that conference, (to say nothing of those who are gone,) we cannot believe would either originate or connive at a falsehood.

Mr. Wesley's ordination of Dr. Coke—his appointment of the Doctor as superintendent of the methodists in America—his nomination of Mr. Asbury as joint superintendent—his Liturgy prepared for us as an Episcopal Church, in which are contained the different forms of ordinations for deacons, elders and superintendents—are all matters of notoriety and of record. That the conference published what they had done immediately after the session terminated, is also certain, for we have the original edition of the minutes now before us. And in these minutes they designate the church by the appellation of the "Methodist Episcopal Church." This took place several years before Mr. Wesley's death; and that the conduct of Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury, and the Conference of 1784, both as to the form of church government they adopted and the particular designation of "Episcopal Church," by which they denominated it, met his entire approbation, we have the most unequivocal evidence. We admit that he disapproved the title of "bishop," which was some time afterwards given to the superintendents, and for this he had particular reasons; which, however, were peculiar to him, and grew out of his relation to the established church of England: but could not be expected to have the same influence upon us, who had *dissolved* that relation, both as citizens and as a religious society. We "stood fast in that liberty wherewith God had so strangely made us free." As an "Episcopal" Church, we thought proper to call our "episcopoi" by the title which our translators of the Bible used in translating the original Greek word—namely, "bishops."

But we had taken the title and formed a constitution under the appellation of the "Methodist Episcopal Church" for years before the title of bishop was known amongst us—and in fact, whether our episcopoi had been called superintendents, overseers or bishops, we should still have been an episcopal church. As to the charge of our having at any time considered our bishops as a distinct ministerial order, contra-distinguished from, and superior to, presbyters or elders, it has no foundation in fact. The very circumstance of our having acknowledged the *right* of elders to ordain, is a sufficient refutation of the allegation. We consider the episcopacy a superior office in the church—not a distinct ministerial order; and this is the light in which it has been considered ever since its institution. What then can justify or extenuate the abuse which has been poured upon our ministry by the Union Society or their agents, the editorial committee. We do not complain of them for differing in opinion with their brethren in reference to the necessity or propriety of perpetuating our episcopal form of government; but we contend that their moral and social obligations are violated by thus defaming the characters, and unjustly impugning the motives of our ministers, by thus charging them with palming a "surreptitious," "spurious episcopacy" upon the church, and perpetuating their usurped authority by "printing and publishing a falsehood," "caucusing," "manœuvring" and "buying men by the sale of indulgences."

Dr. Jennings, when he complained so dolefully of injuries inflicted upon him, "an aged minister," ought to have reflected that, as one of the editorial committee of the "Mutual Rights," he had assailed the spotless reputation of men who laboured in the ministry before he knew what religion was—nay, perhaps before he was born—some of them indeed are happily beyond the reach of calumny or detraction; but their friends still live and retain the most lively recollection of their worth. He cannot suppose that the characters of such men as these were, can be held up to public odium without wounding the feelings of their friends and spiritual children, who still survive—nor indeed without affording matter of rejoicing to the infidel and the profligate, and greatly injuring the cause of God. If there were any just grounds for the accusations, we should be grieved, but we would not complain. We might even then think that it might be wise, as well as kind, to throw the mantle of charity over the errors of the dead, if not of the living, especially when it is admitted that they did much good in their day and generation; yet if any were disposed to do otherwise, we love truth enough to submit in silence. But when these accusations are totally destitute of truth, and only got up to subserve a party purpose—we cannot and dare not be silent—for Jerusalem's

sake we will not hold our peace. That the allegations were not believed even by those who made them, is sufficiently obvious. They could not upon any other supposition, consent to waive their objections to the rest of a system of government represented to have been gotten up in fraud, and sustained by falsehood, intrigue, manœuvring, and selling indulgences, provided it might be so altered as to give them a greater participation in the management of the concern. Yet this has been most kindly offered!! As may be seen by reference to their printed memorial to the General Conference.

Extract from "The Sovereignty of Methodism in the South, by a Virginia Methodist."

"Suppose some president of the United States should succeed to establish himself in the presidential chair for life, and should have a law enacted forbidding the citizens on pain of imprisonment, banishment or death, to 'inveigh' against the government, either by *objecting* to any of its laws, by *petitioning* for their repeal, or using any *argument*, through the medium of speech or of the press, to evince their impropriety; would not the American people find this to be a 'gag law,' a hundred degrees worse than any they have ever yet had to complain of? And in what would such a law differ from our present 'gag law' in the discipline, on supposition that it is to be so explained as to sanction the administration of Benton Field? It will require all the clerical talents of old Virginia to point out any difference, excepting that the latter only involves the church penalty of expulsion: in principle, they would be precisely the same; and this principle, with a sufficient enlargement of power in the hierarchy, would soon bring the christian community again under the penalties of corporeal punishment. Yet this tyranny is sanctioned by the Virginia Annual Conference!

"An orthodox brother took an early opportunity to give the public the following information: 'We have had a fine conference, and the appointments of the preachers you will receive in a few days. Three bishops attended—bishop McKendree, whose health and spirits are better than usual, and bishops Roberts and Soule, who are in good health.' Why, herein is a marvellous thing, that the preacher in charge had several members expelled from the church, in defiance of all law, both human and divine, and yet 'a *fine* conference,' with 'three bishops' at its head, and could not discover this to be 'mal-administration.' The next number of the Christian Advocate (the 27th) contains a more full account, in which we are informed 'the venerable bishop McKendree addressed them in a very affectionate and feeling manner. He then concluded with an exhortation to holiness,' upon which the conference afterwards

‘adopted the following resolution’—‘That the doctrine of holiness, recommended by our discipline, and forcibly impressed in the address of the bishop, be duly weighed and enforced by the members of this conference.’

“It is hoped, ‘the members of this conference,’ in ‘duly weighing’ the subject of christian holiness, will try to acquire just views of its nature and extent; and that while they justly expostulate with those who oppose the doctrine, as being advocates for sin, they will not forget to raise a warning voice against those who make professions of holiness and sanctification as a *cloak* for their sins. By what tests is it to be ascertained that a man is *not* sanctified? They are such as the following: ‘He that saith he is in the light, and hateth his brother, is in darkness even until now.’ (1 John ii. 9.) ‘If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar.’ (1 John iv. 20.) ‘But, why dost thou *judge* thy brother? or why dost thou *set at nought* thy brother? For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.’ (Rom. xiv. 10.) ‘But Diotrephes *who loveth to have the pre-eminence* among them, receiveth us not—prating against us with malicious words: and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and *forbiddeth* them that would, and *casteth them out of the church*.’ (3 John ix. 10.) For a man who is in the habit of such conduct, as is thus condemned by the divine laws, to get up in love-feast and say, ‘at the last prayer meeting, or at the last camp meeting, I was *sanctified*,’ is an insult to God, and to all christian morality. Alas! how many thousands are zealous advocates for the doctrine of sanctification, and are ready to fly into a passion in defence of christian *perfection*, who are merely fond of the *sentiment*, not because they have a true *hungering and thirsting after righteousness*, but because the doctrine is a distinguishing *peculiarity of methodism*? The doctrine of holiness is valuable beyond expression, and may be justly regarded as the great consummation of christianity; but sectarian partiality appears to corrupt every thing it touches; and such are the mysteries of human nature, that it would be no matter of surprise if the time should come, when a man would be ready to cut his brother’s throat, in defence of the doctrine of christian perfection. In what way our Virginia brethren intend to ‘*enforce*’ the ‘doctrine of holiness,’ they have not explained: perhaps their conduct will hereafter explain it.”—*Ib.* pp. 261—263.

“A keen-eyed opponent will be likely to perceive, with terrible indignation, that we are waging war against ‘the episcopacy!’ Yes: this absolute sovereignty is the centre point of our opposition; while it stands, in its present mighty energy, all reformation is hopeless, and an increase of moral darkness and corruption will be inevitable. We have no quarrel with

our present bishops: we believe them to be good men; and that none of them have become, by many degrees, so corrupted by this same great 'episcopacy,' as many of their tame underlings and dependants have become."—*Ib.* p. 264.

Extracts from "An Address to the Friends of Reform, by N. Snethen."

"DEAR BRETHREN,

"You have heard of what was done in the bounds of the Virginia Conference; and will hear of the proceedings of the Baltimore Annual Conference, in the case of Dennis B. Dorsey. I notice this last case as proof of the fact, that the itinerant preachers have taken a stand against reform, or representation, which must change our relation to them. We are no longer to consider ourselves as standing upon the open and equal ground of argument with those brethren in behalf of a principle; but as the supporters of what we conceive to be truth and right, opposed by power. From the beginning, I have considered the avoiding of written discussion by almost all the itinerant preachers on the old side, as ominous of this issue, and have not ceased to anticipate the time, when a display of the plenary powers in their hands would in effect place us as lambs among wolves, and call upon us to be 'wise as serpents and harmless as doves.'

"I understand the text in its original application, 'I send you forth as lambs among wolves,' that is, with truth and right, among those who have both the power and disposition to resist your principles and to destroy you, but I give you no means of self-defence, but the wisdom of the serpent, tempered with the harmlessness of the dove. We have all along asserted, that there is power enough in the rulers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to excommunicate us all, and we are still of the same opinion; but if any one should doubt it, let him remember, that the body of men of whom we mean to ask for a fish, may give us a scorpion; that the very General Conference of 1828, may make rules, if they conceive they are not already made, to reach every reformer.

"Our relation, I say, was changed in point of fact, from the day the power of the itinerant preachers waked into action. The most distinguished preacher who should advocate the principle of representation would find himself obnoxious to power, as well as the least member of the church. No man among us has power to oppose to power; and truth or right in the mouth of a minister would not lose its lamb-like helplessness, when assailed by the power of a majority of itinerant preachers. This majority have all the claws and all the teeth, and therefore, every man may be made to fear.

"This fact, brethren, we ought not by any excitement of zeal, to lose sight of for a moment. I therefore repeat it, truth or

right in the grasp of power, is like lambs among wolves. Hitherto reformers have spoken and written freely and openly, they have had no secrets, the wisdom of the serpent was not necessary. The charge of imprudence, and the general cast of all the objections brought against them, goes to shew, that power was not roused, that the prey though within reaching distance, was not seized. Henceforth the character and conduct of methodists must rapidly change. On the side of power there will be fierceness, and on the side of right concealment. Threatenings and suspicions will mightily prevail. A name has already been demanded, not I presume to satisfy curiosity, or to confute arguments, but for punishment, or at least impeachment.

Heretofore it is doubtful if a single travelling preacher has written for the Wesleyan Repository or the Mutual Rights, who was not known to his superiors. The writers themselves often confided their proper names to their brethren, and so they felt not like lambs among wolves; but a few examples in the annual conferences will put an end to this kind of generous rivalry. Travelling preachers themselves will be thus painfully taught the wisdom of the serpent—taught to elude power by policy. What a temptation will this prove to trespass upon the innocence of the dove? Brother Dorsey, it seems, was advised by his friends (in this advice I did not participate,) not to answer any question which might criminate himself. This refusal to answer questions, this putting the conference upon the proof of his guilt, made a part of his offence. Who then did he thus offend? No one but the members of the Annual Conference. Now mark, brethren, the importance of this whole transaction: not to brother Dorsey merely, but to us all. Let this procedure be established as a precedent, and of what avail will the maxim of our Master be to us? How can we maintain the harmlessness of the dove? How escape the jaws of power without dissimulation? Surely if we have no right to keep our own secrets among those who make a man an offender for a word, we have no means of self-preservation, but in the unqualified wisdom of the serpent.”—*Ib.* pp. 248—250.

“I deem it proper, brethren, that in this portentous change, in this state of our affairs, that you should hear my voice, should see my name. It will, I know it will, it must be asked, now the time is come to try men’s souls, where is Philopisticus? Where is Adynasius? Where is Senex? Where is the man who was among the foremost to challenge us to the cause of representation? Where is Snethen? I trust that while he is among the living, but one answer will be given to this question—he is at his post, he is in the front of the contest, he is shouting *on*, brethren *on*! and if he fall, it will be with a wound in his breast, and with his head direct towards the opponent.”—*Ib.* p. 251.

“Letter addressed to the Rev. Dennis B. Dorsey by a Travelling Preacher.

“MY DEAR SIR,

“Not knowing you *personally*, nor the *place* of your residence, I ask the privilege of addressing you through the medium of the ‘Mutual Rights,’ for *approving and recommending* of which, you now stand *suspended* as a methodist travelling preacher! The Baltimore Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, with three or more bishops present to direct and shape its measures, have by a solemn resolution, after several days’ deliberation, *officially* decided that a presbyter in the church of God, deserves *punishment and disgrace*, because he adopts opinions and sentiments on the subject of church government, which are received and acted upon by a large majority of protestant christians, throughout the various divisions of the religious world! I cannot pause, my brother, to write the many denunciations that common sense, throughout an outraged community, will pronounce upon this OVERBEARING ACT OF ABANDONED TYRANNY! But I hasten to inquire why were *you* selected as the *victim*, the *sole* victim, when it was in proof before them that others were in the same condemnation! Why did not my lord of Canterbury, who ‘rides in the whirlwind and directs the storm’ among you, and by whom *even* bishops are tithed at will, together with the active and zealous Doctor, the principal officer in his ‘star chamber,’ select a goodly number of victims, and offer an *appalling* hecatomb at once! Was it because heaven had deprived you of health? Was it because you were remote from home and friends? Was it because, like your Master, you were poor, and with the humble sharer of your fortunes, ‘had scarcely where to lay your head!’ Did they wish, by increasing your *mental* inquietude, to strengthen the desolation *without*, and so send you to a premature grave? Or was it intended by the *horror* of the example made of you, to say to other reformers, ‘if *you* have the *word*, *we* have the *sword*!!’ I cannot refrain from asking where *three* or *four* members of the Baltimore Conference were during this LABOURED DEED OF HARD-EARNED INFAMY? Did they sit by, in inglorious silence? But, my brother, be not discouraged, recollect that the great father of us all, as methodists, was by a similar body, and in the *same* city, forty years ago, declared unworthy of name or place, in that communion, in the bosom of which you now find yourself honourably degraded. When Mr. Wesley was informed of this, he declared in a letter, now in my possession, that the American bishop had ‘no more connection with him.’ But I trust you will not so decide in relation to your blinded and prejudiced brethren—‘yet a little while,’ and this stupid, *laudean*.

zeal, will be cooled in the humiliation and disgrace of your persecutors; public indignation will chastise their pitiful pretensions to *lordly* inquisition over the rights and consciences of those, who have too much intelligence and too much candour to think and act by their prescription! To conclude, my dear sir, I beg you to accept the best wishes of a stranger, 'faint not in the day of evil,' the honorary overthrow you have sustained, for the rights of conscience, will make strangers your friends: on hearing of the treatment you and others received at the Baltimore Conference, ten or twelve persons within my charge have declared for *reform*, and are ready to aid you with their *influence* and *purses*. Wishing the speedy restoration of your health, and that you may live to see the curse of religious oppression banished from the church and the world—I remain yours in the kingdom and patience of *Jesus Christ*.

"VINDEX.

"*April 27th, 1827.*"

[*Ib. pp 270, 271.*

REMARKS.

The Virginia Conference, it seems, had refused to annul the verdict of an inferior church judicatory, by which some of the disaffected members of the church had been expelled. This was the unpardonable sin for which the author of "The Sovereignty of Methodism in the South," reviles them so bitterly. He sneers with ineffable contempt at the account, which he says an oldside brother took an early opportunity to give of the Virginia Conference, in the Christian Advocate. This "fine conference, with three bishops at its head," is the object of the most bitter irony. The venerable bishop McKendree concluded a very affectionate address to the conference, with an exhortation to holiness of life—and the conference, deeply affected with the importance of the subject, "adopted the following resolution"—"That the doctrine of holiness recommended by our discipline, and forcibly impressed in the address of the bishop, be duly weighed and enforced by this conference." This pious determination of the conference, is most contemptuously sneered at by the writer, and he insinuates pretty clearly a suspicion that their pretended concern upon the subject of holiness and sanctification is only a "cloak for their sins." To be sure, he does not positively say so; but no man of candour, who reads his remarks, will hesitate to say, that he intended his readers should make such an application of his inuendoes. He gives some scripture quotations, by which he purposes to show what sanctification is *not*; but which really describes very wicked men, and all this with a sly insinuation that the members of the Virginia Conference sat for the picture. "It would be no matter of surprise," he says, "*if the time should come, when a man would be ready to cut his brother's throat, in*

defence of the doctrine of christian perfection. In what way our Virginia brethren intend to enforce the 'doctrine of holiness,' they have not explained: perhaps their conduct will hereafter explain it." And from the account he has given of these brethren, he leaves us every thing to fear from their method of enforcing the doctrine!! He declares, however, that "we [the reformers we suppose] have no quarrel with our present bishops: we believe them to be good men;" at least, comparatively so, for they believe "*that none of them have become, by many degrees, so corrupted by this great 'episcopacy,' as many of their tame underlings and dependants have become.*" What an exalted degree of goodness does he attribute to the bishops—they are not *by many degrees* as corrupt as their own tame underlings and dependants!! The methodist reader will perceive, by the last paragraph of the extract, an express avowal of the main object contemplated by the reformers. They are, he says, at war with the episcopacy, as the centre point of opposition. They had all along told us, that they only wanted a local and lay representation in the General Conference!!

The act of the Baltimore Conference which excited the wrath of Mr. Snethen and Vindex, to such a tremendous height, was simply denominating the "Mutual Rights" "an improper periodical work," and requiring Mr. Dorsey, one of the preachers composing the conference, to cease from recommending and circulating it—which was nothing more than requiring him to desist from propagating slander. This, however, he not only refused to do, but after he had made a declaration of intentions, and an avowal of sentiments, totally inconsistent with his social relations and engagements to the church, he concluded by the most cruel insult on the feelings of his brethren—"I have read the Mutual Rights, sir, for myself," said he, addressing the president, "*and think highly of the work, and recommend it to every member of this conference.*" The conference left Mr. Dorsey without an appointment for one year, and he forthwith betook himself to the pious work of circulating not only the "Mutual Rights," but Mr. McCaine's "History and Mystery of Methodist Episcopacy." On the character of the latter work it would be useless to comment. Suffice it to say, that a deist, who had any respect for his character, would have been ashamed of writing it.

For this necessary measure towards Mr. Dorsey, Mr. Snethen calls the ministry, who composed the Baltimore Annual Conference, "wolves"—and wolves too who are at war with the lamb-like harmlessness of the members of the church—against whose ferocity there was no defence but by concealment—who had "all the teeth and all the claws, and therefore every

man may be made to fear." He advises his brethren, therefore, to take refuge in the wisdom of the serpent, and conceal their movements. He himself, however is above all such prudent measures. He had told us before, that he was the leader of the mighty revolution which was in progress. "When he first began to write he had but one colleague." The reformers would be totally dismayed at the sight of *these* "TEETH AND CLAWS," if not encouraged by the voice of their captain. "I deem it proper, brethren, that in this portentous change, in this state of our affairs, that you should hear my voice, should see my name. It will, I know it will, it must be asked, now the time is come to try men's souls, where is Philopisticus? Where is Adynasius? Where is Senex? Where is the man who was among the foremost to challenge us to the cause of representation? Where is Snethen? I trust that while he is among the living, but one answer will be given to this question—he is at his post, he is in the front of the contest, he is shouting *on*, brethren on! and if he fall, it will be with a wound in his breast, and with his head direct towards the opponent." He ought to have said *enemy*, as opponent is too mild an appellation for antagonists such as he describes—"wolves" with such formidable "teeth and claws!!"

Vindex is not a writer to deal in figurative descriptions of the enemy. He was a late recruit, and proselytes often find it necessary to establish a reputation with their party, or to do away all suspicion of their sincerity, by manifesting extraordinary zeal for the common cause. He, therefore, does not mince the matter; but in the overflowings of his wrath denounces the conference as a *star chamber court*. Our ministers of the Baltimore Annual Conference are, according to this writer, not only tyrants, but "overbearing," "abandoned," "infamous" tyrants.

We cannot comment on such language as this. It so outrages all decency as to set both criticism and commentary at defiance.

It may be, however, important to let the reader know what Dr. Jennings, and his local preacher associates, in the Baltimore Union Society, who published these violent invectives and denunciations against our ministers, thought of them a few years ago; before he and his friends had become so effectually *reformed*. At the district (local preachers) conference of 1820, the Rev. Dr. Jennings, James R. Williams and William Kesley, were appointed "a committee to prepare and publish from the Journals, minutes of the district conference, accompanied with an address to the local preachers of the Baltimore district." They performed their duty, and the address, signed by the above committee, contains the following high commendation of our mi-

nistry, and *the order of things* which then existed, and which does still exist in our church.

“Under the providence and grace of God, the methodist church is favoured with a ministry corresponding to the ORDER OF THINGS which prevailed in the days of THE PRIMITIVE SIMPLICITY AND POWER OF THE GOSPEL. Our itinerant elders and missionaries are called, to make haste and spread the glad tidings of peace and good will far and wide, as their work may direct, whilst WE are expected to assist in building up and establishing them that believe, within the circle in which we move.” All was right in 1820. Travelling preachers and local preachers, each occupying their proper stations in the church, and both uniting in the good work of the gospel ministry!! The Union Society was nevertheless formed in 1824, and the publication of the Mutual Rights commenced in August of the same year. The first volume of the work contains some of the most inflammatory of the preceding extracts, and the severest remarks on the itinerant ministry, which in 1820 *corresponded to the order of things which prevailed in the days of the primitive simplicity and power of the gospel!!*

CONCLUSION.

The reader will bear in mind that the foregoing extracts are taken from a periodical called the “Mutual Rights.” That this periodical is published monthly, by the Union Society of Baltimore, under the immediate superintendence of a committee elected annually by the society, and that the members of that society as well as the editorial committee were members of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Their membership in this church was a voluntary act, to which they were in no way constrained or even solicited, and could be renounced whenever they pleased. We have given only a small specimen of the bitter revilings and defamation, published in their periodical, against the pastors of our church. The work consists of three octavo volumes besides the monthly numbers from August last. No limits which we could reasonably prescribe to ourselves, would contain all the exceptionable matter to be found in this most extraordinary publication. We have, however, given enough to show the absurdity of the cry of persecution, which has been raised by those who have been held amenable to christian discipline, for their unfounded attacks upon the reputation of their brethren. It certainly cannot be pretended that they have been *persecuted for righteousness sake*.

Our brethren who may have hastily made up their opinion against the proceedings of the church in Baltimore, from the pro-

tests and other publications of the accused members, will now have an opportunity to review the whole affair: and cannot fail to perceive the fallacy of the allegation so often reiterated against us, that we persecuted these members of our church, in order to prevent investigation and suppress inquiry, on the subject of reform. Dr. Jennings, in "An address, intended when written, to have been delivered before the District Conference," not only repeats this stale and groundless allegation, but attempts to show, that the publishers of the "Mutual Rights" are justified in speaking evil of ministers by the example of Mr. Wesley. He quotes, from Moore's Life of Wesley, instances in which he says, Mr. Wesley "exposed the conduct of the ministers of the Church of England, in a language as strong and pointed, as any of the writers in the Mutual Rights have ever used, in respect to any minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church." But in order that the example of Mr. Wesley in this particular should avail the doctor and his associates, it will be necessary for them to show, that Mr. Wesley's allegations against those ministers of the Church of England, were as unfounded as those made in the Mutual Rights against our ministry, manifestly are. For, with due deference to the doctor's superior learning, to speak that which is TRUE is not "EVILSPEAKING," however severe it may be. Evilspeaking, according to the definitions of the word in Johnson and Walker, means "slander," "defamation," "calumny." The doctor's defence then, ought to have been a very different thing from what we find it. Instead of declaiming on reform, and the iniquity of endeavouring to prevent it—he should have set himself to prove the truth of the allegations, made by him and his associates, against our bishops and other ministers. If he had shown them to be true—the charge of "EVILSPEAKING" could not have been sustained, although injuring the reputation of another by publishing his faults, or failings, can only be justified by some apparent necessity for the disclosure. "And shall we," says the doctor, "accuse the author of the General Rules [Mr. Wesley] of speaking evil of ministers, because he there published the *truth* concerning those ministers who opposed themselves to hinder his work? I will not." No indeed, nor we either, for the apostle Paul, who expressly enjoins it upon us, "to speak evil of no man;" and the apostle Peter, who exhorts us to "lay aside all malice and all guile and hypocrisies, and envies, and all *evilspeakings*," equally condemned the conduct of men of all ranks and conditions in life, in terms of very severe rebuke. If the doctor then can prove, what has been alleged both against the living and the dead in the Mutual Rights, he will not only stand acquitted of "evilspeaking," but prove conclusively the necessity of a thorough reform, not only of our government but of our morals.

We confidently believe, however, that no attempt will ever be made to *substantiate* charges of such a heinous nature against the ministers of our church.

May we not hope that even our brethren of the Queen Anne Union Society, who have scolded us so unmercifully, will upon reading our statement and defence, come to have a better opinion of the methodists in Baltimore? Perhaps they may yet do us the justice to believe, that we are as far as they can be from being "ready to expel a christian from our society, because he dissents from us in opinion upon church government, or thinks proper to utter his dissent." We assure them, if such dissentients only confine themselves to truth in their statements, and keep within the bounds prescribed by the law of christian charity in their remarks, we shall not question their right to inquire into the fitness and propriety of our ecclesiastical polity. We hope, moreover, that the learned judge who makes so conspicuous a figure in that association, will interpose the ermine of justice in favour of our Annual Conference, whose case has been so hastily and severely condemned by that society. His honour will recollect, that the cause was decided solely upon ex-parte testimony, and hence the verdict might, *a priori*, be suspected to be unjust. We have now, we think, adduced sufficient evidence to show that the Baltimore Annual Conference were not to blame for having denominated the Mutual Rights an "improper periodical work," nor for leaving Mr. D. B. Dorsey without a ministerial appointment, because he refused to desist from circulating a work in which his brethren in the ministry were so mercilessly defamed and abused. We therefore pray, that his honour will please to grant a new trial.

When the Queen Anne's Union Society shall consent to review what they have said, both of the church in Baltimore and of our Annual Conference; they will find a material discrepancy between their first and their last publication. We are told in the last, that "they [the travelling preachers] can do or say what they please against the discipline or each other with impunity; but if a local preacher or private member, dare to say they are not immaculate, or do wrong, they are accused of speaking evil of ministers, and are tried and expelled"—but how will this declaration comport with their former address, in which they complain so bitterly of the proceedings against Mr. Dorsey, *a travelling preacher*, for circulating the Mutual Rights. Surely both these complaints cannot be true, for they are directly contradictory. Again, they mention, among the good designs of the writers for the Mutual Rights, "that they laboured to show that our church government was based on monarchical principles, and originated by our beloved founder, Mr. Wesley,

before the declaration of independence." The declaration of independence *we believe* took place in July, 1776, and our church government was instituted in December, 1784. Our brethren will not take it unkind, if, after we have called their attention to these oversights, we venture to suggest the necessity of keeping their matters better *posted up*, and of being more cautious and circumspect in pronouncing sentence upon their brethren. We shall, at all times, be thankful for their advice, and for reproof when deserved; but we confess it would be more acceptable if it were given in better temper.

Justice requires us to admit, however, that our brethren of the Queen Anne's Union Society were, from their distance from the scene of these proceedings, liable to be imposed upon, and therefore we can readily excuse their misapprehensions of our motives and actions. But what shall we say of the committee appointed by the Convention of reformers, (which met in Baltimore in November last,) "to inquire into the *alleged* grounds of the trials, &c." then going on in this station? This committee say in their Report, as adopted and published by the convention, that "from the evidence before your committee, it appears that the aforesaid local preachers have been suspended, and the lay-members tried, and some of them expelled, *purely on the grounds of their holding dissent from, and publishing their objections to some parts of the form of our church government and its administration.*" The committee do not deem it necessary to exhibit before the convention, in detail, the particulars of these trials, as the committee has not been able to obtain any information, contradicting the printed reports of these trials, in the hands of most, if not all the members of this convention." Now we would ask, what "*testimony*" this committee had "*before them?*" Was it not wholly ex-parte? Were not the "printed reports of these trials," of which they speak, the accounts which the accused themselves had published, in order to forestall public opinion? The committee had, it seems, been appointed to inquire into the *alleged* grounds of the trials—and surely whatever they might believe as to the *real* grounds, they have not given the grounds *alleged* for the prosecution. The charges and specifications which had been furnished to every one of the accused might have satisfied the committee of this fact: but if they had intended to fulfil the duties of their appointment, as set forth in the resolution of the convention, the means were within their reach. Those who preferred and sustained the charges—the committees who tried them, and even the pastor of the church who presided at the trials, were at hand—but no inquiry was made of them. And why? They certainly were competent to say on what *alleged* grounds the trials had been predicated: but the committee might

have obtained information in this way, which would not have suited their *purpose*. They therefore confined themselves to the testimony of the accused and expelled members themselves, and their report was shaped accordingly.* It was, we suppose, on the authority of this report, that the convention said, in their address, "ministers have been suspended, members have been arraigned for trial, and an extraordinary combination, systematically organized, to break up the Union Society of the city of Baltimore, and all this has been done merely *because they have advocated in the Mutual Rights a lay representation in the legislative department of the church.*" It is difficult to repress the indignation which necessarily arises from a view of such pitiful management as this. There is so much of electioneering trick and contrivance in the whole procedure—so obvious a design to get up something that might serve a party purpose where the truth may not be known, that we are ashamed to see it practised by men professing godliness—and we are still more humbled when we have to own this committee was composed of methodists!!—and of methodist reformers too!! We cannot admit the propriety of such measures even in political conflicts. Christians, we think, cannot be allowed to conform either to the spirit or practice of the world, even in civil contests for office or emolument; but if it cannot be prevented under such circumstances, we beseech our brethren to let neither the spirit nor practice come any farther—let them not pass within the vail of the holy sanctuary—the church of God.

The vehement railings against our itinerant ministry, for not consenting to model our government according to the wishes of the reformers, are manifestly as unjust as they are cruel, reformers themselves being judges. They have told us again and again, that the members are not yet prepared for the change—that we are not yet sufficiently enlightened, either to appreciate its utility or to carry it into effect if it was granted. This is repeated in amount, more than once by Mr. Shinn, and is responded by more than one other writer in the *Mutual Rights*. It will moreover appear, from the showing of reformers themselves, that at the last General Conference, among the very few members of the church who petitioned for a change in the government, there existed great differences of opinion as to what that change ought to be. One of these differences was very important indeed, namely, whether the local preachers should be separately represented in the conference, or be amalgamated with the laity. To prevent this discrepancy in their future

* The members of the committee were "brothers Willis Harris, of North Carolina, William Disney, of Ohio, William S. Stockton, of Philadelphia, Charles Avery, of Pittsburg, and Nicholas Snethen, of Maryland."—*Proceedings of General Convention*, page 7.

petitions, has been one of the specious reasons assigned by reformers, for organizing Union Societies.

Now it will not be denied, that our itinerant ministers found the methodist church government where it now is, in the hands of the ministry, and as the reformers tell them, that the membership are unprepared for a change—as one in a hundred have never asked for it—and as those who did desire it, were not able to agree amongst themselves on a plan of reform—with what propriety can the travelling ministry be accused of oppression and tyranny—with withholding the rights of the laity, and lording it over God's heritage, for not having made the innovations contended for by the Union Society of Baltimore. The question now is, not whether the contemplated alterations be right or wrong. If we were to admit that nothing has been proposed but what might be justly claimed; yet the General Conference have never yet had an opportunity to act on the measure with a due regard to the wishes of the membership. The allegations then against the itinerant ministry are utterly unfounded, according to the showing of the Union Society themselves.

The master spirits, who have so agitated our church of late, cannot, however, claim the merit of originality, either for their pretensions or their measures. Mr. O'Kelly and Mr. Hammett preceded them in this country, and the following extract from D. Isaac's "Liberty of the Pulpit defended," page 24, will show that our brethren in England have passed through a similar conflict.

Mr. Isaac says, "A few turbulent spirits, some years ago, agitated the methodist society—[in England.] The burden of their song was, that the preachers were tyrants, and the people suffering the most grievous oppression; that nothing could save the connexion but a new constitution, founded upon what they termed 'more liberal principles, &c.' The preachers, conscious of their own integrity, and of the attachment of the members in general to the old plan, refused to concede what was so peremptorily demanded.

"The 'friends of the people,' as they were pleased to style themselves, *separated*, formed their new constitution, and invited the people to enter into the glorious liberty of the children of God. It turned out that about *one* in *eighteen* joined the new connexion, so that *one* was the people and the other *seventeen* were nothing at all. Of those who left the old and joined the new connexion, a large proportion returned to the fold of Christ before two years had elapsed. History furnishes innumerable examples of this kind. The one had a right to withdraw if he felt dissatisfied, but he had no right to attempt the imposition of his new yoke upon the necks of his brethren."

Having thus given a faithful exhibit of the proceedings in

relation to certain members of the Union Society in this city, together with the motives and reasons which impelled us to the measure, we venture to appeal to all our brethren, whether they be those who favour the opinion, that the present organization of our church polity ought to be essentially altered, or those who are opposed to such changes—whether they are itinerant preachers, local preachers, or laymen—provided they be friends of peace, lovers of God and the brethren—we appeal to them, we say, with confidence for the propriety—nay, for the necessity of the measures which the church in Baltimore has pursued in relation to her offending members.

Mr. Wesley had told us, repeating it perhaps from one of the ancients, that as the soul and body made a man, so the spirit and discipline made christians. It will be acknowledged that the church had a choice of difficulties; she must permit her wholesome discipline, which had heretofore hedged in the fold, to be trampled down and destroyed, or she must lose a part of her members. The latter appeared to be by far the least evil of the two, and therefore was preferred.

We would put it to our brethren who favour reform, whether it ought to be effected by such means. What advantage would be reaped by the most salutary changes in our church government, or by the establishment of a system of ecclesiastical polity, which should be the wonder, the admiration and model of the christian world—if, in the achievement, the character and the standing of your ministry should be destroyed? If, in the party violence by which the revolution had been effected, the world had been taught to look on your travelling ministry as tyrants, whose power had been wrested from them, by the people they had enslaved by means as despicable as they were wicked. What access could such degraded ministers be expected to have to those whom they sought to call from error and sin, and what influence over those who should continue under their charge?

In political contests, the government may be changed, and all who administer it may be dismissed from office, because the people can appoint new rulers and administrators; but we could not substitute our ministry; the great head of the church, having reserved to himself the right to call and qualify the preachers of his gospel and the pastors of his church.

We have now redeemed the pledge which we gave in an early stage of these proceedings—namely, that we would, after the proceedings should have terminated, publish a plain statement of the whole affair. We submit the statement to the consideration of our brethren here and elsewhere, with some anxiety we confess, though not on our own account: for although it would be a source of great satisfaction to us, to find we had

acted so as to meet the approbation of our brethren generally—yet their censure cannot deprive us of the consolation we enjoy, from the consciousness of having been actuated by the purest motives, and the most sincere desire to promote and to secure the peace and prosperity of the church. But we cannot repress the anxiety we feel for the verdict they shall give; because the interests of the whole Methodist Episcopal Church, and consequently the interests of the thousands who depend on her ministry for the word of life, are involved in the decision. If you sanction the violent measures of the Baltimore Union Society against our itinerant ministers—if you are of opinion that the cruel imputations and unfounded allegations, not only against those who have ceased from their labours and gone to their reward, but against those who now occupy their places, and bear the ark of the Lord, ought to be permitted and suffered by the church—the time is come when we have nothing left us, but to inscribe “*ICHABOD*” on the institutions of methodism—institutions which have carried the light of truth into the dreary abodes of darkness and sin—and by which the primitive design of preaching the gospel to the poor, has been so successfully accomplished—then indeed the glory will have departed from Israel. *“But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things which accompany salvation, though we thus speak.”*

We are your brethren in the bonds of a peaceful gospel.

GEORGE EARNEST,
JACOB ROGERS,
ISAAC N. TOY,
SAMUEL HARDEN,
ALEXANDER YEARLEY,
JOHN BERRY,
FIELDER ISRAEL.

BALTIMORE, *Feb.* 4, 1828.

P. S. The reader will please to notice the following correction:

The decision of the committees in the cases of the lay-members, as stated page 26, is not exactly correct. The committees reported no decision on the third specification. As it was not sustained, they did not deem it necessary to notice it.

In page 24, the six laymen from whom the several committees of trial were constituted, are called a “committee,” which might lead the reader to suppose they all served in each case; this, however, was not the fact. The several committees consisted occasionally of three, but for the most part of five members—never of six.

APPENDIX.

A.

TO THE MINISTERS AND MEMBERS OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THIS CITY AND ELSEWHERE.

Beloved Friends and Brethren,

As attempts have been recently made with great industry and determination by the members of the Union Society, and their friends, in this city, to injure, if not to destroy my reputation; and as every man in our highly privileged nation has a right to be heard before sentence is pronounced upon him, I will ask your indulgence, while I present you with a *correct* statement of certain late official acts of mine, which have been made the groundwork of this calumny. Permit me, in the outset, to declare that in the course I am about to pursue, I am actuated by no feeling of personal hostility against any member of the *Union Society*, nor am I in the least opposed to a calm and proper discussion of the principle of reform in our church. I never did, nor will I ever, receive charges against any member of the church, on account of his *opinions* in relation to church government. Had our reformers and their advocates, in the statements which they have given of the late proceedings in this station against certain members of the Union Society, given the facts as they really occurred, and stated the *whole truth*, (which as honest men and good citizens they were bound to do,) the sacred duty which I am now about to perform had never devolved upon me. But by that course they could not have secured their purpose. They were fully aware that, by giving a fair and open statement of the proceedings of which they complain, they would seal their own condemnation. For upon such an exhibit, every friend to peace and order in the church could not but decide against them. It was, therefore, their policy to raise a loud and lamentable cry of *proscription* and *persecution*. To work upon the credulity of such as were not acquainted with the true grounds and merits of the above proceedings, it was found necessary to effect an artful combination of truth and error. Every attempt to sustain and protect the violated rights of the church, must be considered

base partiality. Every measure employed to preserve order and ensure an equitable decision, must be cried down as stern and inflexible tyranny. And where it was found inexpedient to *modify* facts, the most strange and unwarrantable inferences must be drawn from them.

The first circumstance which drew forth the indignation of the members of the *Union Society* against me, was, my refusing to ask any ministerial assistance from those local preachers who were known to be members of that society. And although they perfectly knew the ground on which this act was predicated, they were determined to make the impression abroad, that it was "*because they were tainted with the American principle of representation,*" and "*had expressed their decided disapprobation of the proceedings of the Baltimore Annual Conference, in the case of the Rev. D. B. Dorsey.*" Here we see at once, the principle developed, and the determination manifested, which characterize every account which they have given of the subject under consideration. When a man states what nobody can believe, he at once defeats his own object; he injures no one but himself. But when he artfully blends truth and error, in order that the latter may acquire credit by means of the former, it may not only require time, but considerable pains to detect him. Of this the late attempts of reformers furnish an illustration. If, therefore, it shall be made satisfactorily to appear, in the view now presented, that they have not paid a sufficient regard to candour and veracity in their statements of my official conduct, I must not be condemned. The necessity of the measures may be deplored, but the motives by which they were dictated cannot but be approved.

Had there been nothing to justify the measure which was pursued in relation to those local brethren, but a mere difference of opinion in regard to church polity, I should have felt it my duty to wait upon them, and to have invited them to a participation in our ministerial labours. No individual could more deeply regret the *necessity* of the step that was taken than I did. But what was I to do? Those local preachers, in conjunction with the other members of the *Union Society*, had aimed a most deadly blow at the character of the Baltimore Annual Conference. Not satisfied with the abusive epithets which they had employed in various companies and places in the city, they at length came out with a publication in the newspapers, representing the conference as having been guilty of conduct "*which was not warranted by the scriptures nor the discipline of the church,*" and as having "*evinced a determination to keep the membership and local ministry in ignorance of the true principles of church government.*" And was there

nothing in all this, but *the American principle of representation?* Was this most unreasonable and unjustifiable attack upon the character and rights of a conference consisting of nearly one hundred ministers of Christ, to be viewed in the light of a simple "*expression of disapprobation?*" Was there nothing contrary to the "*harmlessness of the dove*" in this matter? Could any political cabal have manifested more bitterness, or spoken of their opponents in terms of keener reproach? I at once saw, that consistently with my relation to an injured conference, and my responsibility to God and the church, I could receive no aid from those brethren who had thus defamed us. For what would such an acceptance on my part have been, but a virtual acknowledgment of the correctness of their course? To me it really appears rather remarkable, that those local preachers should have been *willing*, after the character they had given of the Baltimore Annual Conference, to be associated with any of its members, as fellow labourers in the vineyard of Christ.

To show still further, and in a manner which, one would think, could not fail to carry conviction to the mind of the most pertinacious reformer himself, that it was not for holding principles of reform that those preachers were not invited to participate in the pulpit labours of the station; two local brethren, who were then considered reformers, and whom reformers do not hesitate still to claim, were invited to take regular appointments, and their names are now on the plan. This invitation was given under a firm persuasion that those two brethren were in favour of changes in our system of church government; but it was known at the same time, that they were not members of the Union Society, and consequently that they had not participated in the unhallowed work of calumniating the conference. A third brother, who was also known to be in sentiment a reformer, would have been invited, had it not been understood that he was about to leave the city.

I would now ask, whether it can be possible, all the circumstances of the case considered, that the most bigotted among the reformers themselves can believe, that those local brethren who have told, and reiterated so doleful a story about *persecution, proscription and degradation*, were passed by, merely because they were *reformers*? How then can they, while striving to make such an impression, even indulge a hope, that *the God of truth* will sanction their efforts? Some change for the better in our ecclesiastical polity may yet be effected, but surely it does not require much sagacity to predict, that it will have to be accomplished by different men, and different measures.

I shall now proceed to notice succinctly, though I hope satisfactorily, the various other charges of tyranny and injustice, by which reformers, and some few others who they have inveigled into their service, have endeavoured to render me infamous in the eyes of the church and of the public. My brethren may be assured, however, that I should not deem it necessary to move in this business, were it not that the unsettled and undiscerning among us, may have been, and still may be imposed upon by the artful misrepresentations which have been made.

Thinking men must at once perceive, that as our reforming brethren are disposed to quarrel with the itinerant ministry *only*, it required but little policy in the members of the Union Society here, to induce them to draw off attention as much as possible from the membership by whom the charges were preferred, and fix it upon the preacher, whose duty it was to execute the discipline. They well knew, that if they could make it appear that the preacher had acted the tyrant, and *lorded it over God's heritage*, in the part which he had to take in the business, it would go to confirm the many hard sayings which they had previously uttered and published against the travelling preachers in general. But as it is far from my design to question the motives of those brethren, without furnishing the most satisfactory reasons for doing so, I must intreat the reader, should he find it practicable, to compare the accounts which they have so industriously propagated, with the statements which he will here find. And if, after a fair and candid examination, it shall be thought, that I have violated the rights of the accused members of the *Union Society*, I will readily submit to the heaviest penalty which justice demands.

As a committee composed of disaffected persons,* and ap-

* The meeting at which the committee was appointed, was gotten up, by the following notice, published in the newspapers.

"A meeting of the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church *opposed* to the late proceedings against the local preachers and members in this city, will be held this evening, at half past six o'clock, in the Baptist church, corner of Front and Pitt streets.

December 10th, 1827."

On the appearance of this notice, some of the friends of the church, had the following published.

"NOTICE—A notice having appeared in the newspapers calling a meeting of the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church who are opposed to the proceedings in reference to certain persons, now under trial according to the discipline of the church, it is hoped that the members of the church will perceive the impropriety of attending said meeting, as it is obviously designed to prevent the due administration of the discipline.

December 10th, 1827."

The committee was composed of the Rev. Moses M. Henkle, from the state of Ohio, who was an active member of the late convention of reformers, and who holds no membership in our church in this city; Mr. John J. Harrod, against whom charges had been preferred and sustained; Dr. W. Zollickoffer, who had just settled in Baltimore, and who has since withdrawn from the church; Mr. W. Rusk, a member of the Union Society in Fell's Point station; Mr. W. C. Spindler, brother-in-law to one of the suspended local preachers; Mr. G. Evans,

pointed in part by the *very men* who had been tried and condemned in the church, have, in a report which they have consented to acknowledge, given a most artful and methodical list of my alleged crimes in relation to the above trials, it will save me the trouble of consulting any other documents in order to ascertain the grounds of the calumny. Would it not have been well, however, had this most officious committee informed us by whom they were appointed, and whence they obtained their information? The public would then have been much better prepared to judge of the intrinsic credibility of their report, while their claim to integrity would no doubt have been contemplated in the proper light. Surely, of all men, reformers of churches ought to be least disposed to act in the dark, and those who undertake to clear such as have been condemned by courts, civil or ecclesiastical, ought to be most particular to obtain the fullest information within their reach.

But perhaps the committee thought concealment would not be criminal, where the reformation of the church was the object; and as they may feel inclined hereafter to inform the public, by whom they were appointed, and who *furnished* the statements which they have published, I shall confine myself particularly to their publication.

It is alleged by this committee, that the accused members of the Union Society were deprived of an important privilege, in not being permitted on their trials to object to the committee of trial, or as we shall see presently, in not being permitted to set aside every man who was supposed to be dissatisfied with the doings of the *Union Society*. Now, who does not see, that upon the principle here laid down by the *Union Society's* committee, the veriest transgressor in the church might in many places retain his membership as long as he might feel disposed to do so? It cannot be unknown to our friends, that methodist preachers, (great as reformers have represented their power to be,) cannot compel any member of the church to serve on a committee in any case. And hence, any accused member, no matter how criminal he might be, with the privilege for which reformers contend, might have it within his power, to set all law and authority in the church at defiance!!

It must have appeared, obvious to every one who witnessed the spirit which the accused members manifested when on their trials, that they would have objected to any man who had been suspected of a design to defend the rights of a calumniated and

who had been heard to say, that the reason why he did not join the Union Society, was, he could do more for the cause of reform out of said society than he could were he a member of it; and Mr. R. Varden. It is stated that Mr. Harrod "declined serving on the committee." He however, was present at the meeting, and voted for the resolutions.

suffering church. Indeed a leading member of the Union Society, when acting as *spokesman* for one of his brethren, declared in the most positive manner, that the accused members were determined to give the brethren who had preferred the charges "all the trouble they could." This declaration he repeated; and I am sure it must be recollected by all who were present at the time. He at the same time gave their reasons for this determination, which were, that *in their opinion* the charges preferred against them were unfounded, and they viewed the whole business as an act of persecution. Thus it appeared, that *they were determined to give all the trouble they could*, because they were not permitted to decide upon their own cases.

I do most unequivocally declare, that had any one of these accused brethren been able to show, that any member of the committee called to try him was his personal enemy, that his objection would have been attended to, and the committee-man so objected to, immediately displaced. For if I hate with a peculiar hatred, any principle that lives in the human soul, it is that of tyranny.

It is true, perhaps, that some of those persons who were called to sit upon the cases of the accused members, had both thought and spoken of the "*Mutual Rights*," as an offensive publication, and might have censured the *Union Society* for the offensive matter which it contained; but they, to a man, most solemnly and unhesitatingly declared, that they had never said that any member of that society ought to be expelled from the church for it. They moreover declared, from time to time, during the progress of the trials, that their minds were not made up, and that they would come to no decision, until they had patiently and faithfully examined the testimony. But if no member of the church can, without a departure from justice, be suffered to sit upon the case of one, the propriety of whose conduct he may have previously questioned, though he may in so doing have acted from the purest and most christian motives, it must be seen at once, that the church has no other guarantee for the preservation of her purity, than a want of policy in the transgressor of her laws. For the offender, be his crime what it may, has only to get all the brethren within his reach to censure his conduct, and his membership becomes at once intangible!! According to this view, what would become of many of our country classes, where the disorderly conduct of a member is frequently not only known, but condemned in the strongest language by all the members in his neighbourhood, long before he can be put upon his trial? But if those accused brethren *possessed* the right of challenge, why have the late convention of reformers, who met in this city, petitioned

the General Conference to *grant* this right? Why should men pray for a thing which they know themselves to be in possession of? If, on the other hand, those accused brethren did not possess the right of challenge, why did they so strenuously and vehemently contend for it when on their trials? There is a strange inconsistency here, which the ingenious author of the report and the committee together, will never be able to reconcile.

The truth is, those accused brethren, true to their principles, showed very little inclination, when called to trial, to recognize either the authority of the discipline or the standing usages of the church; but were for conforming every thing to *their* notions of the rules which govern the proceedings of civil tribunals, and for availing themselves of all those quirks and quibbles, by which the guilty are so often enabled to escape the just and equitable sanctions of the law.

To retain on a committee men, whose personal hostility to the accused, might divert their minds from the real merits of the case, and thereby prevent the due administration of justice, is, what I believe no methodist preacher would knowingly do: but to dismiss brethren, lest their love and respect for the character of the church should lead them to condemn the schismatic and defamatory acts of some of her members, would be a strange proceeding indeed. The Union Society's committee, however, determined at all hazards to convict me of tyranny and injustice, have told the public, (and I presume on the authority of somebody,) that Mr. T. Armstrong was retained on the committee, (or what *their forensic taste and habits of thinking have misled them to call the jury,*) after having "told Mr. Starr, previous to his trial, that he did not think that he could do him justice, if he were called to sit on his ease as a juror or committee-man: and that he hoped that if he ever should be called to sit on his (Starr's) case, he would object to him, and that this was acknowledged by Mr. Armstrong himself on the trial!!" That Mr. Armstrong did tell Mr. Starr prior to the trial of the latter, that he hoped he would object to him, should he ever be called to sit on his trial, was acknowledged by Mr. Armstrong at the time of the trial. And in this disposition Mr. Armstrong was not singular: for every man who was asked to serve on these committees, declared that he would greatly prefer having nothing to do with the matter in that way; and it was evident that those who consented to serve, did so purely from a sense of duty to God and to the church. But that Mr. Armstrong *acknowledged on the trial of Mr. Starr*, that he had *told* the latter in a *previous conversation*, that he *did not think* he *could do him justice, is absolutely false*. Mr. Armstrong stated no such thing, as may be seen

by referring to the minutes and other documents relating to Mr. Starr's trial.

It is again stated, and held up as a most flagrant act of injustice, that Mr. A. Russell was retained on the committee, even after the accused had offered to prove, by two witnesses, that Mr. Russell had said, *that if he had the power, he would expel the members of the Union Society from the church*; and that the reason I assigned for refusing to admit the proposed testimony, was, "that I felt very much inclined to take brother Russell's declaration." Now as the committee, who have pledged themselves for the correctness of this statement, in all probability, obtained their information *exclusively from the accused party*, it is not very wonderful that they should have given a part of the truth only. I had observed, from the first of those trials, a determination evinced on the part of the accused members, to throw every thing into confusion, and to evade, by stratagem, the force of the discipline. Under this impression, I, in substance, remarked, that if the accused wished Mr. Russell to be brought to trial, he must bring a formal charge against him, and then the matter could be fairly and legally taken up; but that we had met there to try the accused, and not Mr. Russell. And as Mr. Russell most positively denied having ever said what the accused attributed to him, I was led to remark, that *I felt very much inclined to take his declaration*. Mr. Russell still declares, that he never did say that if he had the power he would expel the members of the Union Society from the church; but that he did say, if they were not satisfied with the church, they ought to go out of it and leave it; and that he would do so were he a member of the Union Society. Having known Mr. Russell for years, as a man highly esteemed in the church and by the public for his piety and integrity, I must still say, "that I am very much inclined to take his declaration." I cannot help thinking that Mr. Russell, in this matter, was misunderstood, or, that he has been misinterpreted. For one of those very men, it seems, who have certified that they heard Mr. Russell make the observation attributed to him by the accused, made a statement somewhat similar, in relation to another committee-man previously, but when confronted by the brother, he acknowledged that it was a mistake, and gave a certificate to that effect!!

It is likewise spoken of as a most marvellous thing, by the Union Society's committee, that a committee of three local preachers, should have been appointed to try ten cases of the same kind; and that six laymen should have sat upon twenty-two cases precisely similar. And no doubt but every Union Society man in the land, who has witnessed the *mighty nothing*, that has been made out of this matter, thinks with the

sympathizing committee, that it "is passing strange." Nevertheless, I am fully persuaded that every unprejudiced man who is acquainted with those local and lay brethren who composed the above committees, will say that they were quite competent, both as to number and talents, to ascertain whether or not, the accused persons had, through the "*Mutual Rights*," *spoken evil of ministers, and endeavoured to sow dissensions in the church by inveighing against the discipline.* It has been suggested, indeed, and by the highest authority known among reformers here, that the above committees were intended to settle the great question concerning reform, which has so long agitated our church. But this suggestion is wholly gratuitous, and has only been employed to keep out of sight the real nature and ground of the charges. The question concerning reform, was never intended, so far as I have any knowledge of the matter, to have any bearing whatever upon the decision of those committees. For I do most fearlessly and conscientiously declare, that had any reason been given me to suspect that those brethren were to be tried for their opinions, on the subject of church government, I never would have consented to call one of them before a committee. Why the similarity of the cases should have rendered it improper for the same committee to try any number of them, the Union Society's committee have not thought proper to inform us. They are satisfied to exclaim, "'Tis strange," "very strange," "passing strange." I am very much inclined to think that, if the men who have reported this *marvellous* matter will only examine their own report with care and candour, they will think it "strange," "very strange," nay, perhaps, "passing strange," that they should have been so easily imposed upon by those, whose only aim was, to use them for their own purposes. A glance at the subject, will convince any impartial and reflecting mind, that to have appointed a different committee to try each case, must have precluded these trials altogether. There were thirty-three persons charged, eleven of whom were local preachers. Now admitting it had been determined to bring each case before a separate committee, consisting of five, (and a smaller number, it seems, would not have satisfied the accused members and their friends,) the whole number of cases would have required one hundred and sixty-five persons. Fifty-five of these must have been local preachers, and the remaining hundred and ten laymen. I ask, then, how were the fifty-five preachers to be procured? I had no power to compel any local preacher, even in the station, to serve on any one of those cases. And can the most visionary reader suppose, that men living from twenty to sixty or seventy miles from Baltimore, would have consented, at my request, to leave their families and business, and come to

this city, for the purpose of trying men, who they had cause to believe would charge them with partiality and tyranny, should they be compelled, by the evidence, to decide against them? Had they consented to come, can it be supposed that they would have staid here long enough to examine faithfully the voluminous documents presented as evidence in those cases? or, had it been thought advisable for them to carry those documents home with them, could they *all* have devoted that time and attention to the examination, which would have been necessary to enable them to come to an enlightened and honest decision? But it will perhaps be said, that the difficulty just stated, did not exist in regard to the laymen. True, the difficulty did not exist to the same extent in regard to the laymen; but to have procured a different committee for each of their cases, and especially when neither the nature of the cases nor the common ends of justice called for such a course, would only have served to make the local preachers more loud and clamorous in their charge of partiality and injustice. Let it not be lost sight of, that I had no more authority to command the services of a layman, than of a local preacher. Nor would it have been proper, seeing that a large majority of our members here, as well as in other places, live by their daily labour, to have requested one hundred and ten of them to engage in a business which would have taken weeks of their time; and particularly when there was no good reason to offer in favour of such a measure. To the calm and peacefully disposed members of our church, argument here, will not be thought necessary. But as the unsettled and litigious seem disposed to respect no act of any church tribunal, unless it be in exact accordance with the practice of civil judicatories, I here take the privilege of meeting them on their own ground. This I shall do by inserting a short extract from "Bacon's Abridgment," vol. 3. sec. 757. "It is no good cause of challenge" says this distinguished author, "that the juror has found others guilty on the same indictment; for the indictment, in judgment of law, is several against each defendant, and every one must be convicted by particular evidence against himself."

The next charge which I shall notice, is the one relating to a letter of mine, written on the 21st of July last, to a supposed friend, in the city of Alexandria, D. C. The circumstances by which I was led to write this letter, are the following: In looking over the June number of the "Mutual Rights," my eye was suddenly caught by my old friend's signature; and here I first learned that Thomas Jacobs had become a reformer. My conclusion however at the moment was, that his brethren would never be able to sour and set his mind against the church, as I believed they had done the minds of several others with whom I was acquainted. But what was my astonishment, when, on

looking over his communication, I found it marked by all that acrimony of expression, which has rendered the productions of our reformers in general, so peculiarly offensive and disgusting, to the friends of peace and brotherly love! I immediately determined, as his sincere friend and wellwisher, to convey to him in a *private letter*, some of my thoughts on the subject of reform. This was done before I had any idea that charges would be preferred against a single member of the Baltimore Union Society. I did verily believe, that the Union Society had, through the medium of the "Mutual Rights," "spoken evil of ministers," and "endeavoured to sow dissensions in our societies, by inveighing against our discipline," and that the discipline properly enforced, would without genuine humiliation and acknowledgments on their part, expel them from the church. This opinion I expressed in substance in my letter to Mr. Jacobs; but I have no recollection of having mentioned it to an individual in this city, except one or two of my colleagues, prior to my receiving the reports of the committees in the cases of the accused brethren. Sometime after the charges were put into my hands, and before any accused member was cited to trial, a friend informed me, that the reformers here, had received a part of a letter which I had sometime before written to a person in Alexandria. I remarked, "that there was nothing in my letter to Mr. Jacobs that would render it improper for me, to act in the cases of the accused members of the 'Union Society,' as it was written before I had thought that charges would be preferred, and particularly as I had neither said nor done any thing to induce the brethren to prefer the charges." His answer was, "but you know they stop at nothing, shameful as has been the conduct of your Alexandria friend, they will injure you by it, if they can." I confess, I was not a little astonished, that Mr. Jacobs could consent to commit so unwarrantable a breach of friendship and confidence; and I frequently gave it as my opinion, that it would yet be found to be the act of some unprincipled person to whom he had shown my letter.*

The prediction of my friend, as above stated, was in a short time verified. That part of the letter which our reformers thought they could turn to their own account, was published by the Rev. Dr. S. K. Jennings, with his protests and argument. It was quoted and published by some of the doctor's coadju-

* Mr. Jacobs, in a letter which he wrote me subsequently to the above transaction, says, "I could have escaped by saying, (which thing is true), that another man did it; but I scorn the poor [here a word is obliterated by the seal] subterfuge. I never will put my burden on another. I would rather suffer all the consequences of my own acts." I must here leave the reader to draw his own inference.

tors; and all this, to make the public believe, that I had prejudged the matter, and therefore that I ought not to have received the charges. What must be the character of a cause, that could deign to seek support from such an expedient? In my letter to Mr. Jacobs, I had manifested no personal enmity towards a single member of the Union Society; for indeed I felt none. The opinion which I expressed, and which has been laid hold of, and used with so much artifice against me, was wholly the result of a comparison of certain sentiments and expressions contained in the "Mutual Rights," with the discipline of our church. And will any man say, that I had not a right to express the opinion, that the laws of our church had been violated, and her rights infringed, when urged to the conclusion by such evidence? Surely not. In what respect then did I, by the expression of such an opinion, put it out of my power to afford the accused members of the "Union Society" a fair trial? Ought the brethren who made out the charges against the members of the "Union Society" to have waited until some preacher was sent them, who had never spent a thought on the productions contained in the "Mutual Rights?" How ridiculous should I have appeared, if, when the charges were presented to me, I had said, "I can receive no charges against any member of the 'Union Society,' for I am afraid the members of that society, have violated the discipline; indeed I have given such an opinion already to a reformer; you must therefore carry your charges to some man, who has no knowledge of the subject; and if you cannot find such a man, the church has no alternative, but to groan and bleed under the merciless lacerations inflicted by her disaffected members!!" How ridiculous, I say, would I have appeared, had I attempted to offer any such reason for refusing to do my duty? Would not reformers themselves, have secretly laughed at my folly, though they might openly have complimented my integrity? That I might have pursued a course in relation to the trials of the accused members, widely different from the one which was pursued, I readily admit. I could, I dare say, had I been disposed to give those brethren "the mere semblance of a trial," have procured committee-men from the "Union Society;" I could have permitted the accused to abuse our government, our travelling preachers, the brethren who preferred the charges, the committees* and myself, not only for hours, but for weeks to-

* The Rev. Thomas Bassford, who was one of the committee that sat upon the cases of the accused local preachers, was asked by one of the accused, "if he approved of, and voted for the Pitt street address?" His reply was, that "he did not approve of that part of the address which related to Mr. McCaine's book, yet he voted for the whole, for the sake of unanimity." This reply was caught at, with the utmost eagerness, and an inference has since been drawn from it.

gether. I could have decided, that all the unheard of, and irrelevant questions, which were proposed for the purpose of confusing the minds, and torturing the feelings of the committee, were strictly in order. Had I done so, I have no doubt, I should soon have read my justification in the "Mutual Rights," however indelibly the sentence of condemnation might have been inscribed on my own conscience and in the *Book of God*. But I can make no apology to those brethren, for having determined to encounter all the fierceness of their wrath, rather than secure their approbation; which was only to be purchased by a shameful dereliction of duty. I will venture to predict, that should the period ever arrive, when our church shall concede the privileges claimed by the accused members of the "Union Society," she will soon need *reformers* possessing something more than the *bare appellation*.

Again, I am complained of, for having refused to grant "the Lord's free-men" the liberty "of reading such defence, as under those circumstances of disadvantage, they were prepared to make." In doing so, it appears, I acted worse than a *heathen*; for even a heathen governor granted *St. Paul* the liberty of *answering for himself*. Now, if "the Lord's free-men," who are so fond of ranking themselves with apostles and martyrs, and those who disapprove their measures with Jews and heathens, had manifested an apostolic, or even civil spirit, when on their trials, their speeches would have been listened to with attention and respect. But instead of this, it seemed as if some of them had determined to try, who could say the bitterest things, and include the greatest quantum of abuse within the smallest compass. Mr. William Kesley and Mr. E. Strahan, were the only persons I believe, who were prevented from finishing their speeches, and they no doubt well recollect the cause. The minutes, in the cases of the above named persons, will show, that they were interrupted wholly on account of the violent remarks which their papers contained. Perhaps those brethren may not have forgotten, that they were told at the time they were requested to desist, that "no company of honest men were under any obligation to sit and hear themselves abused by the hour."

which goes to impeach Mr. Bassford's *moral honesty*. The following is Mr. Bassford's explanation, "I did not object to that part of the address which relates to Mr. McCaine's book, because I doubted the truth of the remarks, but because I thought them rather severe." This explanation, which was given in substance, at the time the question was asked, ought so far to have *satisfied moral honesty*, as to have prevented the malicious blow which has been aimed at Mr. Bassford's reputation. Indeed I greatly mistake the characters and standing in society of those brethren who preferred the charges, and those who composed the committees, if they do not, to a man, occupy as high ground in point of *moral honesty*, and every other virtuous quality, as any reformer in the land.

Another mighty act of injustice, it seems, I committed, in refusing to gratify an accused member who had requested to be tried by the *whole society*. To this charge I shall be prepared to plead guilty, whenever one disinterested and intelligent person in our church, or any other, shall seriously say, that I ought to have called together, between *two* and *three thousand* persons, to sit in judgment on Mr. J. J. Harrod.

It is further insinuated, with much apparent respect for the cause of piety, but in reality, with a determination to make me appear odious in the eyes of the christian, that I showed no more respect for an important christian duty, than I did for the rights of the "Lord's free-men." For when one of "*the accused desired me to open the proceedings in his case, by an address to the throne of heavenly grace, I refused to do so.*" The Union Society's committee, here refer to the case of Mr. W. K. Boyle. And a trivial circumstance, which a manly sense of dignity would have disdained to notice, is most adroitly introduced for the purpose of promoting, what for months has been a leading object with reformers and their adherents—the prostration of my character. That I am *an unprofitable servant*, I readily acknowledge. And that I too often *leave undone the things which I ought to do*, I feel no disposition to deny: but that I sinned in refusing to comply with Mr. Boyle's imperative demand, in the case now under consideration, the most fastidious casuist would scruple to admit. However, that my brethren may be prepared to judge of the whole circumstance, through which this additional thrust has been insidiously aimed at my reputation, as a christian minister, I will proceed to state it in as few words as possible. Soon after Mr. Boyle was requested to appear, and answer to the charges which had been preferred against him, I received a note from him, in which he informed me that he was "a public officer," and that, "if tried at all," he "must have a night session." He also requested me to inform him, whether he might not "bring a lawyer" with him "to plead his cause." Now, on receiving such a note from a member of the Union Society, and a public officer too, is it any wonder that I thought he was disposed to treat my summons with contempt? And under such an impression, was I to blame for declining a formal answer? At the time appointed to hear Mr. Boyle's defence, he, however, attended; and soon after I entered the room, he got up and declared, in the most angry and vociferous tone, that unless his case was immediately taken up, he would leave the house. He was informed that should he take that step, his case would have to be taken up in his absence. To this he replied, "Yes, I know you have the power. You have the power to turn me out of the house. Come, and kick me out of the house, will you." Some one,

whose case should have been taken up before his, gave place to him; and this, it was thought, would, in some measure, quiet his rage. Vain was the thought. He immediately began to upbraid me, in the harshest manner, for having refused to answer his note. I gave him, in substance, the reason assigned above. He replied, "I never was treated so before, by a decent man, in my life. I am an ignorant man, and if I could not beat my meaning into your skull, how can I help it." He was told to desist from abuse, and confine his remarks to the subject on which he had been summoned to appear there. "Well," said he, addressing himself to me, "I'll tell you what I want you to do; I want you to go to prayer the very first thing." This imperative demand was accompanied with every symptom of rage and malevolence. He was told, (and this is the point, and the only one in the case, that has been laid hold of by the Union Society's keen sighted committee) that he was at liberty to pray as much as he pleased; but that, as we had not opened the case of any other brother with prayer, we should make no change for his accommodation. Much more might be related concerning the violent and unchristian behaviour of this *venerable reformer*, while on his trial; but suffice it to add, that a brother who was on the committee, was so disgusted at his conduct, that it was with some difficulty he was prevailed upon to attend an adjourned meeting that was had on the case.

I am charged, it seems, with another terrible act of oppression, in having *requested some of the accused brethren to give testimony against themselves*. And here it may be proper to notice, more fully than has yet been done, the policy by which the members of the Union Society, and their defenders, have been induced to avoid, most studiously, the terms, *preacher in charge*, and *committee*; and in lieu of them, to use the terms, *judge* and *jury*, when speaking of the above trials. Now, whatever credit they may acquire for their ingenuity, in adopting this policy, I am sure they will deserve none for the honesty and purity of their motives. It is not very difficult to see, that if our church judicatories differ in nothing but the name from civil tribunals, all the chicanery and unjustifiable management which are too often employed before the latter, may be used before the former. Should such a state of things ever exist in the church, what will be the consequences? Must they not be the destruction of all brotherly union and christian confidence? A man may be arraigned for some flagrant violation of the laws of his country; and such proofs of his guilt may exist, as may induce all who have any knowledge of the transaction to believe that he is really guilty; yet from some flaw in the indictment, or some other technical defect in the proceedings, he may be acquitted. But what in the view of

honest people is the amount of such acquittal? Does it clear the character of the culprit? Does it enable him to return with an unshrinking confidence to the society of the virtuous and the honourable? No, the best that can be said of it is, that it is an escape from justice, effected by artifice and ingenuity. Now, what genuine christian, we ask, could wish to hear of such escapes in the church of God? What real friend to religion, could ever desire to witness any thing like trick or manœuvre in the family of Jesus Christ? What society of christians under heaven, could embrace in the arms of a holy friendship and affection, a member whose character rested its only claim to their confidence, upon some paltry quibble, some unimportant technical peculiarity? Is it possible that the high minded christian, conscious of his innocence, could ever feel disposed to resort to such measures, in order to shield himself from the decision of a committee composed of his brethren? We cannot believe it. Indeed it could scarcely have been imagined, before some of the *fruits of the late attempted reformation in our church* had become visible, that the time was at hand when we should see some of our members seeking to evade the decision of a legally constituted church tribunal, by such methods as no innocent and high minded citizen would think of employing before any tribunal in Christendom. Equally far from our minds was the thought, that a crisis was approaching, when we should hear our brethren refuse to give testimony in the case of an accused member, when requested to do so, and particularly when they were known to have knowledge of the facts!! Yet, such a scene was actually witnessed, during the progress of the above trials. When indirect threats and bitter invective had failed to intimidate, and artful interrogatories failed to entangle the minds of the brethren who preferred the charges, and of the committees who were to try the cases, several of the accused persons came to the determination, that they would not say whether they were, or were not members of the Union Society. In vain were they told, that their simple denial should be received, and that the proceedings in the case should instantly cease; for the charges were founded upon the acts of the Union Society, and nothing else. In vain was it urged upon them, that they were bound by all those moral and spiritual relations, which they sustained to the church of which they were members, to say yes, or no. Some of their brethren whose cases had been previously taken up, were then called on as witnesses, and requested to state what they knew of the matter. Some of them replied, that they could state nothing positively. Others most abruptly refused to give a syllable of testimony on the subject; and to crown the whole, the secretary of their society, who was sent for as a witness, entered the room with a law book under his

arm, from which he intended to prove, that as he was interested in the event, he was not bound to give testimony in the case!! This indeed was a novel scene to take place on the trial of a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church; and especially before a tribunal composed of his brethren.

I will now ask the candid reader, whether the honour of religion, the interests of the church, and the nature of the case, did not justify the opinion, that those members were bound to answer the question; and whether their refusing to do so, ought not to have been considered a tacit acknowledgment of the fact? Indeed, to say that it was improper to request those brethren to state whether they were members of the Union Society or not, and equally improper to request their associates to bear testimony in the case, would involve at once the monstrous absurdity, that if the Union Society, or any other self-created society that hereafter might exist in our church, should publish the rankest socinianism in doctrine, and the grossest libertinism in morals, and every member of the church should believe them guilty, they could retain their membership for life with the utmost security!!

The Union Society's committee who, no doubt, through the whole of the report to which they have subscribed their names, had a single eye to "*the right of instruction*" as well as to the "Mutual Rights," have given it as "their decided opinion, that I violated the discipline of the church," in rejecting testimony from without. It is true, the discipline does say, that "witnesses from without shall not be rejected;" and it is just as true, that the testimony referred to by the committee, was wholly inadmissible. Had it not been so, it would have been most promptly received. But as the reader may wish to know the circumstances, I will here briefly state them, and then leave him to draw his own conclusions. The accused members, in order to have as many of their friends present at their trials as they might think proper to invite, found it necessary, (as we are not in the habit of admitting spectators on such occasions,) to call them all witnesses. And for several evenings in succession, we were regularly presented with a list of their names. But what they intended to prove by this long list of nominal witnesses, remains a secret, I presume, to all but themselves to this day. Mr. W. Starr, (on whose trial the affair now under consideration took place,) thought proper to bring with him as witnesses, two respectable citizens who were not members of our church. By one of them, he said he intended to prove that he was a peaceable man in his neighbourhood, and by the other, that the "Mutual Rights" was not a work calculated to *occasion strife, breach of union, &c.* in the Methodist Episcopal Church!! The reader will at once judge what was the

delicacy of my situation. Mr. Starr was not charged with being a disorderly man in his neighbourhood, and therefore no testimony in relation to that point could be admitted. And to have permitted a person who had no connexion with the Methodist Episcopal Church, to dictate to her members what kind of books she ought to countenance, would have been a proceeding as novel, as it would have been ridiculous. It was stated, therefore, that the testimony of those gentlemen could not be received; as it related to no fact having any bearing upon the case. It is highly probable, however, that the Union Society's committee, who have given it as *their decided opinion, that I violated the discipline of the church* in this affair, have it in their power to plead, that *they had no personal knowledge of the particulars*; but made up *their decided opinion* against me, from the statement of the accused party!! Query. Could it have been through ignorance that Mr. Starr was led to offer this very singular testimony in his case? Or did he wish to excite the indignation of those gentlemen against me, knowing that such testimony as they had to offer could not be received?

I shall now make a remark or two on the case of Mr. J. P. Howard; for no doubt, those who have seen what the Union Society's committee have published in relation to this case, feel some wish to know what there is in it, that "out-herods Herod, and deserves to be noticed." The committee have stated, that "Mr. Howard, one of the twenty-two laymen, was cited to trial on the above charges and specifications; was found guilty, and expelled the church;" and that "his offence, of course, as charged, was being a member of the Union Society; and as such, aiding the Mutual Rights." They then go on to state, "that Mr. Howard never has been a member of the Union Society." Now, as the statement of the committee and Mr. Howard's own statement are contradictory, we shall leave him and them to adjust the difficulty, while we show from the two following certificates, given by brethren of acknowledged piety and integrity, that Mr. Howard was just as culpable as any of his brethren of the Union Society who have been expelled the church.

"Baltimore, Jan. 11, 1828.

"THE REV. J. M. HANSON,

"*Dear Brother*,—In compliance with your request, I hasten to give you the purport of a conversation I had with Mr. John P. Howard, about the time the trials were going on in this city against the reformers.

"During a desultory conversation, on the subject of reform, he remarked, that he had received his charges and specifications; at the same time stating, the difficulty or impossibility

the brethren would have in proving that he was a member of the Union Society, as he had never signed the constitution.

"I immediately urged the propriety of his sending a note to the committee, informing them, that he was not a member of the Union Society, and that the prosecution against him would be immediately dropped—and urged as a reason, that I would not risk my membership, with the privileges of the church, for a cause of which I was innocent. Mr. S. Fairall, who was standing by, accorded with this sentiment.

"He said he would not take advantage of that circumstance, (viz. his not signing the constitution,) as he *considered himself a member of the Union Society*, and would stand or fall with them.

"In a subsequent conversation with Mr. Howard, he acknowledged he had been *elected a member* of the Union Society, but not having complied with a by-law of the society, which requires each member elected to sign the constitution as soon as convenient, he was not therefore a member.

"Yours respectfully,

JAMES BRYAN."

"I hereby certify, that in a conversation had with John P. Howard, about the time he was furnished with a list of charges by the Rev. J. M. Hanson, he stated to me that *he did* consider himself *a member* of the Union Society, and that he was in the habit of attending the meetings of said society.

"JOHN McCORMICK.

"*Baltimore, Jan. 25, 1828.*"

In addition to what is stated in the above certificates, I would remark, that I have now in my possession two letters from Mr. Howard; one of which he wrote before his trial came on, and the other after I had received the decision of the committee in his case; and in neither of them does he deny being a member of the Union Society. He moreover *evaded a trial after sufficient notice had been given him*; and it is well known that the discipline of our church leaves with the committee no alternative in such cases, but *exclusion, where the circumstances of the accusation are strong and presumptive*. It is also well known, that persons who thus absent themselves, forfeit the privilege of an appeal to the Quarterly Meeting Conference. Of this Mr. Howard was himself fully aware; for in the note which I received from him, after his case was decided by the committee, he says, "please to inform me whether you will grant me an appeal to the next Quarterly Conference, or not. I know I have lost that right, unless you choose to grant it to me." Mr. Howard ought to have known, however, that it was not in my power to grant him, what the discipline of

the church denied him. I do not profess to understand fully, what is meant by "*out-heroding Herod*," but I am now perfectly willing to submit the case of Mr. Howard to the judgment of the candid reader.

I highly offended the accused members of the Union Society, it seems, by using the term *guilty*, in my official communication to them, prior to their expulsion; and their committee have severely reprehended me for so doing. If I erred in this matter, I am willing to make any proper acknowledgment to those whom I wronged by the error. But as the charges preferred against those brethren were fully sustained, and as one of the charges related to *speaking evil of ministers*, I was led to use the term usually employed by the members of our church in similar cases, without once suspecting that it would give offence to a single individual. I might have made the same statement in different words, and I now regret that I did not; as nothing could have been further from my design, than a disposition to wound the feelings of those brethren. But as the reader may wish to know something more of the communication which contains the offensive term just mentioned, I will here take the liberty of laying it before him. This I do the more readily, as the document itself, in the notice which reformers have taken of it, has been garbled, distorted and misrepresented with the utmost ingenuity and unfairness. Now let the reader examine and judge for himself.

"Baltimore, Nov. 23, 1827.

"BROTHER,—You are hereby informed, that the committee appointed to investigate the charges and specifications lately preferred against you *as a member of the Union Society*, have, by a unanimous decision, found you guilty of said charges, together with the first and second specifications.

"Most willingly, my brother, would I now dispense with the painful duty which devolves upon me, could I do so as an honest man, and without abandoning the interests of the church. Or, had I cause to believe that the course now about to be pursued, would lead you to make suitable reparation to that church, whose ministers and discipline you have assailed and misrepresented, and to abstain from the like offences against the peace and harmony of said church in future, it would tend more than any other consideration to diminish the painfulness of the obligation which my present situation imposes upon me. For, be assured, whatever my own opinion may be in regard to the course you may have pursued, *as a member of the Union Society*, I most devoutly wish and pray, that you may be led by the good Spirit of God to take those steps which will leave you

still in the possession of all the rights and privileges of church fellowship.

“You must be considered as the arbiter of your own destiny, my brother, in this matter. Your brethren of the committee, men who fear God, whose characters stand fair in the church, and who have disclaimed all feeling of personal hostility against you, have pronounced you, *as a member of the Union Society*, guilty of endeavouring to sow *dissentions* in the society or church of which you are a member, and of speaking evil of the ministers of said church. To this conclusion they have been conducted by a careful and patient examination of the documents put into their hands as evidence in the case. You must, therefore, plainly perceive, that the only ground on which expulsion from the church can be avoided, is an abandonment of the Union Society, with assurances that you will give no aid in future to any publication or measure calculated to cast reproach upon our ministers, or occasion breach of union among our members.

“Be good enough then, my brother, to answer in writing, the following plain and simple questions:

“1st. Will you *withdraw forthwith* from the Union Society?

2d. Will you in future withhold your aid from such publications and measures as are calculated to cast reproach upon our ministers, and produce breach of union among our members.

“Yours, &c.

JAMES M. HANSON.

“P. S. Your answer will be expected in the course of *four or five* days.”

When the above document was sent to those brethren for whom it was intended, my fervent prayer to God was, that it might be made the means of keeping them in the church. But my hopes were disappointed. Some of them, I was informed, treated it with derision; others got angry; and all preferred their membership in the Union Society, to their membership in the church. In the pertinacious adherence of those persons to the Union Society and the “Mutual Rights,” their *leaders* may *rejoice*. And they may call it a high sense of honour, christian fortitude, a zeal for the truth, or what else they please; but there is cause to fear, that they have laid for themselves, the foundation of a tremendous reckoning at the bar of God.

The Union Society’s committee have asserted, that “a number of class-leaders had their classes taken from them by the preacher in charge,” “without crime or fault, other than that of being members of the Union Society, and aiding the Mutual Rights.” This statement, like the rest sanctioned by the committee, will be most readily believed by those who are un-

friendly to methodism, and ignorant of the facts. The plain inference from this dark and groundless insinuation is, that those *unfortunate leaders* were compelled by me, to give up their classes, without any charge being formally preferred against them; for all, who have any sense of propriety, must know, that no leader ought to retain his class, while he is under charges. What, then will the reader think, when I tell him, that no *member of the Union Society* had his class taken from him, till he was formally charged, and a copy of the charges put into his hands; and when they knew that they were under charges, a proper sense of delicacy on their part, should have rendered such a request unnecessary.

A parallel to the assertion of the committee is found in the preface to Dr. Samuel K. Jennings' late address, published since this statement of facts was commenced. The doctor says, that in the time which elapsed, from the suspension of the local preachers, till the meeting of the District Conference, "*I had cleared the way for the unresisted exercise of the power of the government party, by the excommunication or dismissal of so many, if not all the reforming class-leaders, that the conference was made up, with very few exceptions, of officers of the preacher's appointment!!*" This assertion of the doctor's, is, to say the least of it, "strange, very strange, passing strange." Every one who takes his impression of the facts from the doctor's statement, will surely believe, that I excommunicated and dismissed a great many reforming class leaders, perhaps a majority of the Quarterly Meeting Conference, and put in their places men of a certain cast, for the purpose of getting the doctor and his brethren of the Union Society, out of the church. Could the doctor, when he penned the above assertion, have intended to make any other impression? The doctor ought to have stated how many reforming class-leaders I have excommunicated and dismissed; but as he took special care not to enter into any enumeration on this subject, I shall do it for him. The following then is a correct list of the leaders, whom it has been my unpleasant duty to expel in this station: *Lambert Thomas, Thomas Patterson, Wesley Starr, and Samuel Jarrett*. These were part of the twenty-two laymen against whom charges were brought, and who, prior to their expulsion, were entreated to retain their membership, by withdrawing from the Union Society, and promising not to aid any publication or measure calculated to cast reproach upon our ministers, or occasion breach of union among our members.

The only persons who have been "dismissed," or, more properly, who have had their classes taken from them, are, *George Evans* and *Henry Horn*. These two brethren had attended the meeting of *disaffected* members, of which we have

already spoken, and there voted in opposition to the measures pursued in relation to the accused members of the Union Society; and that too, before the cases were determined by the proper tribunals.* Thus, it is seen, that if the doctor had been disposed to give a *fair* statement of this business, he would have said, that I had excommunicated *four reforming class-leaders*, against whom charges had been sustained, and dismissed *two*, who had voted at a meeting gotten up by some *disaffected* persons, *against* the official proceedings of the church. Had he, before hazarding the above assertion, taken the least pains to inform himself on the subject, he must have been convinced that I was not anxious to get men into office for the purpose of expelling him from the church; for at the very time of his expulsion, there were six classes without regular leaders; and I had prevailed upon one who was already a leader, to take charge of the class which had, for reasons just assigned, been taken from Mr. George Evans. But I presume the doctor did not wish to be embarrassed by any such information. It was all important, to make things appear as favourable as he could, in behalf of the excommunicated reformers, and render the traveling preacher, as obnoxious as possible. And hence it is, that impressions so erroneous, are made upon the minds of our brethren at a distance. A malignant eye is kept upon the preacher. All his official acts, which come in collision with the favourite schemes of reformers, are seized with avidity, moulded and fashioned to suit the purpose of the disaffected reporter, and sent abroad with a heart piercing cry, of *oppression and persecution*. These wretched accounts soon find their way into the hands of men, who know what to do with them. The zeal of certain champions in the *good cause* of reform, is blown up to a pitch, bordering on actual phrenzy, and they are hurried into a boldness of assertion, and a bitterness of accusation, the recollection of which, may possibly hereafter, cause their hearts to throb with anguish. Reader, if thou art a methodist, pray that God may, in mercy, preserve us from such attempts at reformation.

I will conclude with calling the reader's attention to the case of a Mr. J. Gephart, who was *dropped* as a probationer, some time during the last summer. Mr. Gephart moved from the town of Cumberland, Maryland, to this city, in the spring of 1826, bringing with him a certificate of membership. But as

* Mr. Horn, the instant the impropriety of his conduct was pointed out to him, *honestly* acknowledged his fault, and said if he had taken the matter fully into consideration, he should not have gone to the meeting. He was then requested to take back his class, but he declined, saying it met at so early an hour, and at so great a distance from his dwelling, that he had for some time thought of giving it up.

he did not present his certificate before the 18th of the following October, the preacher gave him to understand, that he could not be received as a member, but would have to come in on probation. To this Mr. Gephart consented, and his name was accordingly entered on the probationer's book. The annual conference coming on before Mr. Gephart's probation had expired, he could not be noticed in the usual examination in the leaders' meeting, and consequently he was not read in as a member at the lovefeast, which was held immediately after the adjournment of the conference. So desirous however, was Mr. Gephart to be engaged in the *work* of *reform*, that he would not wait to be read into the church as a member, but attached himself to the Union Society, while still a probationer. This was a violation of the constitution of the Union Society, which required that all who were admitted into said society, should be members of the church. But what *respect* ought to have been paid to *constitutional objections* in *such a case*? Mr. Gephart was all eagerness to identify himself with those who had combined, to put down what they did not like in the government of the church, and the Union Society did not wish to run the chance of losing so promising a proselyte. It fell to my lot, at the next quarterly examination of probationers, to mention Mr. Gephart to the leaders' meeting, as one who had stood out his probation. His leader, Mr. J. Haswell, stated that he could recommend him, and no person objecting at the moment, he was marked *admitted*. One of the leaders then suggested that Mr. Gephart was a member of the Union Society; another stated that there could be no doubt of it. It was then determined, that the case should be laid over till the next leaders' meeting, that Mr. Gephart's leader might have an opportunity of conversing with him on the subject. On the following Wednesday evening, the case was again taken up, and Mr. Haswell stated, that he had seen Mr. Gephart, and that he had informed him, he was a member of the Union Society, and that it was his determination to remain there. Mr. Haswell was then asked if he could still recommend Mr. Gephart. His reply was, "I think I can, I still think him a good man." I then remarked, that if Mr. Gephart had been a genuine methodist, he would not have kept back his certificate to the loss of his membership in the church. That I was strongly inclined to think, he would not have attempted to get into the church at all, but with a view of qualifying himself to become a member of the Union Society. That so fully bent was he, on becoming a member of said society, that he had sought and obtained admission there, illegally. And therefore, with such marks of suspicion about him, we could not admit him.

This decision gave great offence to the few members of the leaders' meeting, who belonged to the Union Society. One of them, I was informed, stated, on his way from the meeting, that were he in Gephart's place, he would soon have a *writ on my back*. Another, (a local preacher,) I have been told, in giving an account of the transaction, in a letter to his friend in Washington City, stated that he had been disposed to consider me a man of sense; but that he was then convinced I was not. That I had not sense enough to guide the ship; (the church in Baltimore) that I would be sure to *swamp* her; *but all the better for the cause of reform!!** A choice document was soon prepared concerning Mr. G.'s case, for the Mutual Rights; and the Union Society's committee, least the readers of the above work should have forgotten a case of so much supposed importance to the cause of reform, have given it a place in their *memorable report*. In order to make the best of the matter for Mr. G. and the Union Society, they have stated,—first, that Mr. G.'s withholding his certificate as long as he did, was, "in consequence of not being permanently settled in any part of the city." And secondly, that "his certificate was not declared out of date." Let the reader compare the first statement, with the following certificate, given by Mr. Haswell, Mr. G.'s former leader.

"I do hereby certify, that Mr. John Gephart told me, in a conversation which I had with him, while he was a probationer in the church, the reason why he did not present his certificate sooner, was because his wife persuaded him not to do so. That prior to their coming to Baltimore, his wife had requested him to withdraw from the church; and that she said, now they were out, and it was better to remain so."

"JOHN W. HASWELL.

"January 10, 1828."

I wish the second statement now, to be compared with the following note, received from Rev. D. Steel, the preacher, to whom Mr. G. presented his certificate.

"*Baltimore Circuit, January 18, 1828.*

"MY DEAR BROTHER,—I received your communication on Monday, the 14th inst. but owing to the indisposition of my family, had it not in my power to answer it till the present. The particulars of Mr. Gephart, are, as far as I can recollect them, as follows:—Some time towards the last of October, 1826,

* The person alluded to, will not, I presume, deny having written the above letter.

he called on me at the parsonage, Old Town, and expressed a desire to become a member of the church. He presented a certificate, signed by Rev. Wm. Butler, and dated so early in the spring of the same year, as to make it about eight months from its date, till the time he presented it. Shortly after receiving his certificate, he removed to the city. (Baltimore.) So that he was there at least six months before he applied for admission. I informed him that, in my judgment, the *certificate* had *become useless*, by being kept so long in his possession without being presented. He assigned no reason for the neglect, sufficient to justify it; and was so far from expressing surprise or regret, that he seemed to have entertained but little hope of being admitted on it; and he, without hesitancy, agreed to the proposal, to enter the church on probation. I pursued the same course with Mr. G. that I have invariably done, and have thought myself justified in pursuing, with all who have presented *old* certificates, without being able to assign some good reason for their neglect, in not presenting them before they had *grown out of date*."

"Yours, in much love,

"D. STEEL.

"REV. JAMES M. HANSON."

Let the reader, if he be a friend to fair and honest measures, now say, whether or not, Mr. G. was entitled to admission into the Methodist Episcopal Church? Is the church under any obligation, moral or religious, to make herself a stepping-stone for those who wish to enter "Union Societies?" Is it not enough that she has *nourished and brought up children, who have rebelled against her*; must she adopt, as her sons, those, who wish to enter her pale, for the sole purpose of subverting her government? It was mortifying enough, no doubt, to the members of the Union Society, that their scheme, in relation to Mr. G., did not succeed to the extent of their wishes; but it would have been equally mortifying to the friends of the church here, to have been compelled to raise recruits for the "Union Society."

I have now noticed the most prominent and material charges, which the members of the Union Society, have, both immediately and secondarily, brought against me. In doing so I have been compelled to go considerably into detail. This the reader will readily excuse, when he considers that cases, exceedingly trivial in themselves, have been eagerly seized by my calumniators, and held up to public view, in all the artificial magnitude, that ingenuity and malice could give them. Indeed, the discerning reader cannot but see, that a full and particular disclosure of matters, on my part, had become indispensably

necessary, to save myself from the determined and deadly thrusts of the designing and the misled. Three years only, out of nearly sixteen that I have spent in the travelling connexion, have I been exempt from the charge of those circuits and stations in which I have laboured; and I hope I can, without vanity, entertain the opinion, that it would require much better authority than the "Mutual Rights," to make the people, in those places, believe me a tyrant. Of those who know me not personally, I only ask a candid hearing. From reformers of a *certain stamp*, I look for nothing but censure, abuse and misrepresentation. By striving to discharge my duty honestly, to God and the church, in the cases above alluded to, I have made them my enemies; and, as a gentleman, remarkable for his mildness, said to me the other day, "they are the *bitterest enemies* I ever knew."

JAMES M. HANSON.

BALT. Jan. 28, 1828.

B.

TO MESSRS. G. EARNEST, J. ROGERS, I. N. TOY, S. HARDEN, A. YEARLEY,
J. BERRY AND F. ISRAEL:

Dear Brethren,

As you are about to publish a Narrative and Defence of the late proceedings of our church in this station, in relation to certain trials, &c. we solicit the favour of having our "Reply to the Protest of the minority, in the late Baltimore District Conference," published in the appendix to your pamphlet, together, with a few remarks upon the "Review" of our Reply, which has since appeared in the newspapers. The "Review" is artfully gotten up, and if not counteracted, may tend to mislead the public judgment. We only propose to counteract the misrepresentations of the *reviewers*, by plainly stating and explaining facts. The conflict may be for a while dubious, but the issue is nevertheless certain.

REPLY TO THE "PROTEST"

Of the Minority of the late Baltimore District Conference.

We, the undersigned, late members of the Baltimore District Conference, sincerely deplore the course which our disaffected brethren have, from time to time, pursued in bringing our church affairs before the public, through the medium of the newspapers. As they persist in doing so, we have no alternative but to correct their statements, through the same medium.

The conference met on the 26th December, 1827, 10 o'clock, A. M. at the McKendrian Sabbath School Room, Lombard street. The Rev. J. Frye, presiding elder of the district, and ex-officio pre-

sident of the conference, took the chair, and opened the session with the usual devotional exercises. The first business in order, was the appointment of a secretary. Mr. James R. Williams nominated Mr. J. S. Reese, and Mr. Thomas Bassford was put in nomination by Dr. Bond. At this stage of the proceedings, Mr. J. Chalmers, of Washington, who had sometime before received a letter, signed by three of the members, informing him that they had been suspended, and urging him to attend the conference; perceiving that one of the persons nominated for secretary, was a suspended member, proposed to the chair the following question: "Are the suspended members of the conference entitled to a vote?" Upon which the president decided that, "according to custom, and his impressions and interpretations of the discipline, they were not." He explained what he meant by custom, to be the practice of the annual conferences, quarterly conferences, and, as far as he knew, the district conference itself. There was, at this stage of the proceedings, a general request of the conference, that the president would appoint a secretary pro. tem.; with which desire he complied, and appointed Mr. J. Robb. One of the suspended members appealed from the decision of the chair, in relation to their right to vote. To bring the question fairly before the conference, Dr. Bond moved, that the conference sustain the decision of the chair. The motion being seconded, a debate ensued, which lasted until 2 o'clock, P. M., when the conference adjourned to meet at 4 o'clock, P. M. At 4, the conference met agreeably to adjournment, and the usual devotional exercises having been performed, Mr. J. Chalmers moved, and it was seconded, that the rules of order, adopted by the conference of 1820, be the rules for the government of the present conference. This motion having passed without opposition, the debate of the morning, on the motion to sustain the decision of the chair, in relation to the suspended members, was resumed and continued until after 8 o'clock at night, when the question being taken, and a call for the yeas and nays being made, there appeared, in the affirmative, nineteen votes, as follows, viz:—Messrs. G. Ridgely, J. Chalmers, T. Perkins, J. Daughady, S. Williams, L. Elbert, J. Shane, D. McJilton, E. Hall, S. Gore, N. Harden, J. King, T. Bassford, J. Lazenby, J. W. Harris, G. Summers, T. E. Bond, J. Watters and Z. McComas. Negative, twenty, as follows:—Messrs. S. K. Jennings, A. McCaine, J. R. Williams, D. E. Reese, J. C. French, Wm. Kesley, L. J. Cox, T. McCormick, J. S. Reese, J. Robb, R. T. Boyd, W. Bawden, S. Linthicum, L. Selby, B. Hood, J. Day, G. Wells, N. Hoskinson, R. H. Merriken and John Sharpley—ten of whom were suspended members, and thus voted in their own case, in appeal from the decision of the chair! The president being asked whether the votes of the coloured members were to be counted, stated, that it had not been usual, to take the votes of the coloured members on questions directly involving the character of the white members, and as in the course of the debate it had been alleged, that this was a question in which the characters of the suspended members were involved, he should not direct them to be counted. The conference then adjourned to meet at 9 o'clock, A.

M. on Thursday the 27th ult. Thursday, 9 o'clock, A. M., the conference met agreeably to adjournment; the president took the chair. The secretary pro. tem. not being present, Mr. J. R. Williams proposed that the president should appoint Mr. J. Chalmers, secretary pro. tem.; this being objected to by some of the members, Dr. Bond proposed, in order to prevent altercation and delay, that the conference should agree, without dividing, to elect Mr. Chalmers their secretary; and this seeming to be generally assented to, the president put the question, and it was carried nem. con. The minutes of the preceding day were now read, and corrected, by inserting the names of the members, and by making some slight verbal alterations. When the secretary came to that part of the proceedings, in which the yeas and nays were recorded on the question of the preceding evening, the president stated that he had told the secretary, last night, when he was calling the yeas and nays, that the suspended members had no vote. He now handed to the secretary the following decision, which was read, to wit:

“The vote of the conference last evening, on an appeal from the decision of the chair, was determined in favour of the chair’s opinion, nineteen voting in favour of his decision, and ten *legal votes* against it. The chair cannot count the votes of the suspended members whose names he finds recorded amongst the yeas and nays.

Signed,

JOSEPH FRYE, *President.*”

Some member now asked the president who the suspended members were, to which he replied, that he had the day before, laid upon the table, an official communication from the Rev. J. M. Hanson, giving the information now called for, but that the conference had signified no wish to have it read, he directed the secretary now to read the letter, which was done. From which it appeared that the following preachers had been suspended since the last District Conference, to wit:—A. McCaine, S. K. Jennings, J. R. Williams, D. E. Reese, W. Kesley, L. J. Cox, J. S. Reese, Thomas McCormick, J. C. French, R. T. Boyd, J. Valiant, in all eleven.

A tumultuous and disorderly debate was now commenced by the suspended members, impugning the decision of the president. No motion being before the house, Mr. Chalmers requested the attention of the conference to a motion he was about to make, and of which he had given some intimation the preceding day, he stated that after a whole day’s debate we were precisely where we set out the day before, that we were again about to discuss the question relative to the right of suspended members to vote, and must do the same every day while the pretension was persisted in, and as the members from a distance could not stay from home long enough to go through with the business which would necessarily come before the conference if it continued its session, he thought it would be better to turn the business over to the several Quarterly Meeting Conferences, where it was formerly done with more order, (we do not pretend to give the precise words of Mr. Chalmers, but only our recollection of his meaning.) He now submitted a motion to the following effect, “That the conference consider it inexpedient to continue its session,

and do therefore now adjourn, and consider the conference dissolved." This motion was seconded by Mr. Harden, a member from the country. A state of agitation and tumult now took place, over which we would willingly draw the veil of charity. Mr. Chalmers in vain attempted to offer some remarks in support of his motion—he could not be heard, and sat down. The president called the house to order, and invited Mr. Chalmers to proceed. He again essayed to do so, but was compelled by the tumult to desist. The question being called for, the president rose and said, that, as the members seemed not disposed to hear any argument on the motion, and as the rules of the conference, he believed, authorised the taking the motion without debate, he should put the question. He then requested that all who were in favour of the motion would rise up, and stand until they were counted, nineteen white members and ten coloured rose in favour of the motion. The question was then reversed, the president requesting all those who were opposed to the motion to rise upon their feet and stand until they were counted, the secretary pronounced that there were fifteen opposed to the motion; he counted again and confirmed his previous enumeration—two other members of the conference counted at the same time, and they concur with the secretary that there were but fifteen. The president pronounced the conference adjourned, and called on Mr. Harden to conclude with prayer, with which request he most fervently complied.

The above is a faithful statement of facts. and we will now call the attention of all who feel any concern in the matter, to some circumstances stated in the "Protest" which seem to differ from our account. And first—It is said in the "Protest" that there were twenty votes against the adjournment and dissolution of the conference, but it is admitted that one of them, (Mr. Sharpley,) *was not present when the vote was taken!!* And we assert that he did not request the registry of his vote until after the conclusion of the devotional exercises, with which the meeting terminated, and not until several of the members had left the house. The claim then, would have been as plausible had it been made the next day after the adjournment. Nineteen members, however, including all of the suspended members, have certified that they voted in the opposition, on the question to adjourn. We can only account for the secretary and others counting but fifteen, by supposing, that in the confusion of the moment, some either did not rise at all, or did not stand up long enough to be counted. We will admit, however, that there were in the house nineteen members, who, as they now allege, were opposed to the dissolution of the conference, but we nevertheless deny, that the dissolution of the conference was "effected by the votes of coloured men." The president decided that the question of adjournment was carried, on the report of the secretary, that there were nineteen for the motion, and fifteen against it. But if the whole nineteen who claim to have voted in the negative, had been counted by the secretary, the question would have been decided in favour of the motion, on two grounds. First, because the president could not have permitted the votes of the suspended members, all of whom

were in the negative, to have been counted. And secondly, if he had permitted the suspended members to vote, the house would have been equally divided, and the chair would have had the casting vote, according to our rules. Thus, without reference to the coloured members at all, the conference was dissolved by the white members alone, on the official report of the secretary, as announced by the president, and would have been thus dissolved, had all who claim to have voted, been taken into the account, and also without making any abatement, for the eleven suspended members who were in the negative. With reference to the practice of the conference, in regard to the right of suspended members to vote, we may observe, that of three members who at former sessions came up under suspension, none ever claimed a right to vote, and among the three, was one of those who now makes the pretension, and voted for his own claim.

With reference to the right of the coloured members to vote, there is nothing in the rules constituting and regulating the District Conference, which prohibits the coloured members of the conference from a common right of voting in all cases—it is true, that though well aware of their privileges, they have from prudential motives, refrained from voting in the conference generally, on cases in which the character of white members was directly concerned. Some of us recollect however, that on the trial of a white member at a former session, (which member is now one of the suspended,) a coloured preacher claimed and was allowed his vote *in favour* of the accused. In all other cases, they have exercised their right of voting when they thought proper. On a motion to dissolve the conference, there was an evident propriety in their claiming a right to vote, because it involved a question of privilege, in which they had a common interest, and felt a common concern. And with them, there were twenty-nine in favour of the motion for dissolving the conference.

With respect to the ability of our coloured preachers to vote intelligently, we may refer to the opinion given of them by the conference in the minutes of 1820. “The conference was much gratified in the examination of the coloured preachers; they were found to be men of good report, genuine piety, and several of them possessed of respectable talents.”

In conclusion we may observe, that the suspended members themselves compelled the dissolution of the conference. First—Because they constituted more than one-fourth of the conference, and might, on any considerable division, by voting together, always carry their own measures. Secondly—They had already placed the conference in a situation which would have compelled them to discuss the same question every day, had they continued months in session. Thirdly—The discipline having “provided, that if any District Conference shall refuse or neglect to hold its regular sessions, then the Quarterly Meeting Conferences of the circuits and stations respectively, shall have authority to transact the business of the District Conference”—it was thought best *to refuse* to hold our regular session, especially as it was found utterly impracticable to get a

step forward in the business. Fourthly—Because if the principle were admitted, that suspended members, dropped their suspension at the door of the conference, and had a right to vote, then it might happen that persons suspended either for heresy or immorality, might actually clear themselves by their own vote. And we may add, that the members who came up to this conference suspended, would have constituted a majority of the white members at most of its former sessions.

The above construction of the discipline was pertinaciously contended for in the conference, and furnished an imperative reason for dissolving the body, as the discipline allowed.

It has been frequently alleged, and has been repeated in the Protest, that the suspended members had not been arraigned for any violation of the laws of God or rules of our discipline. We deem it unnecessary, for us to notice the declaration, otherwise than by observing, that they had been charged with evilspeaking, and with endeavouring to sow dissention in the church, by inveighing (that is railing) against the discipline—and we have yet to learn, that railing and evilspeaking are not violations of the laws of God and our discipline.

GREENBERRY RIDGELY,	JACOB KING,
JOHN W. HARRIS,	JAMES WATTERS,
THOS. E. BOND,	THOMAS PERKINS,
DANIEL STANSBURY,	DANIEL MCJILTON,
THOMAS BASSFORD,	EDWARD HALL,
SAMUEL WILLIAMS,	LODMAN ELBERT.
JOSEPH SHANE,	

The following members, who voted with us, having left town; could not have an opportunity of signing this reply—to wit:

JOHN CHALMERS,	J. LAZENBY,
SAMUEL GORE,	G. SUMMERS,
N. HARDEN,	J. DAUGHADY.

Baltimore, Jan. 4, 1828.

A Review of the above Reply appeared in the newspapers, over the signature of "The Authors of the Protest," dated January the 11th, 1828. The "Reply," of which it purported to be a "Review," was dated the 4th of the same month. Are we to understand by the "Authors" those who signed the Protest? We think some of the signers to the Protest live at too great a distance from the city, to have had an opportunity to see the Review before it was published. If this be the case, then we are to understand by the "Authors," those who wrote it; and as neither we nor the public know who wrote the Protest, the Review is anonymous, and we are not furnished with any responsible signature for the assertions it contains.

It will be seen, however, that there were published, first a "Protest," then a "Reply to the Protest," then a "Review of the Reply to the Protest," and now we offer a Rejoinder to the "Review of the Reply to the Protest." If the reader should be unfortunately reminded, by this alliteration, of the "house that Jack built," he must endeavour to suppress his risibility, for this is a very grave matter—

involving a question of right and privilege, so important as never to have been claimed or even thought of, until they were discovered by the would-be reformers, in the Baltimore District Conference. This momentous question is, whether local preachers, suspended by an inferior church judicatory, preparatory to a trial before a superior one, shall be allowed to resume their functions as soon as the judicatory before whom they are ruled for trial, commences its session—before they have been tried, or their suspension in any other way removed—whether, in a word, they shall sit in judgment on themselves, or on each other—nay, more, whether before their own cases come up, they shall be permitted to pass upon the character of their brethren who labour under no suspension—for in the District Conferences, as in the Annual Conference, the first business after they are organized, is an examination of the characters of the members severally. The conference would not acknowledge such rights, and rather than permit the exercise of them, availed itself of the provisions of our discipline, and *refused to hold its regular session*. The church is frequently represented in the scriptures as an army, and we would ask, what would be thought of a court martial, who should permit an officer, suspended from command by a court of inquiry, preparatory to his trial by a superior court, not only to resume his sword and appear at the head of his corps at the time of his trial, but to constitute a part of the court appointed to try him, or at least to try others who were under a like suspension, and under precisely the same allegations?

In the Review of our Reply, it is stated as an “offset” to our complaint against our disaffected brethren, for bringing our church affairs before the public through the newspapers, “that a presiding elder set the example by a publication in *opposition* to reform in a Norfolk newspaper.” Had this allegation been true, it would have been a solitary instance of indiscretion, which could not have justified the *practice* of our opponents. But unfortunately for them, even this excuse cannot be allowed for the practice of which we complain. We shall show by the highest authority amongst reformers, the “Mutual Rights,” that Mr. Devany, the presiding elder alluded to, was compelled, as we were, to correct the statements of reformers through the newspapers, because they had been circulated through that medium. He, therefore, did not set the example. Mr. Devany’s publication is copied into the “Mutual Rights” from the “NORFOLK HERALD.” The introductory paragraph is as follows:

“*Circular*—To the itinerant and local preachers and lay-members belonging to the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Norfolk District:

“DEAR BRETHREN,—Since my arrival in this place, I have seen a publication IN THE NORFOLK PAPERS, purporting to be a circular, ‘addressed to the ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church,’ and signed S. K. Jennings, chairman of the committee, and John French, secretary. As there are some very erroneous statements in the said circular, I feel it my indispensable duty to make a few remarks upon it, in order to prevent you from being led astray.” Mr. Devany replied then to a publication which had

appeared in the Norfolk newspapers. Our reviewers must, therefore, tax their ingenuity for another "offset."

It is alleged, that the conference was dissolved by the votes of coloured men; because we admit, that there was a tie, if these were not counted. Now, we have admitted no such thing. The votes, as counted and reported twice by the secretary, were nineteen white members for the motion and fifteen against it. This count was confirmed by Mr. McJilton and Mr. Watters. No objection was made at the time, to the secretary's report, and the president declared, before the late Quarterly Meeting Conference, that he pronounced the conference dissolved entirely upon the report of the secretary, to which he heard no objection. If, however, the nineteen members who now claim to have voted in the negative, had stood up until the secretary had completed his enumeration, there would have been a tie; but as the yeas and nays would then have been called for, it would have appeared that there were among the negative votes eleven suspended preachers; and these the president could not consistently with his previous decision, permit to be counted. The vote would then have stood, nineteen for the dissolution and eight against it. The conference was thus dissolved by a large majority of the white members composing that body, without taking the coloured preachers into the account at all.

It is stated in the Review, that "Mr. Sharpley came in, in time to hear the journal read." This is the truth, but not the whole truth. The journal was not read *to the conference at all*. Mr. SHARPLEY did not come in until after prayer, and after many of the members had left the house, and those who remained were standing in groups and talking with great animation. Mr. Chalmers was very desirous that order should be restored, until he should have read the journal, as he did not wish to take on himself the whole responsibility of recording and correcting the minutes which he had taken. But finding it impracticable to restore order, some five or six members stood by him until he read the minutes of the morning's proceeding, and amongst these was Mr. Sharpley. After Mr. Chalmers had finished reading, Mr. Sharpley requested him to record his name in opposition to the dissolution of the conference; *stating at the same time, that he was not present in time to vote*. He was very properly answered, that the conference being dissolved, his application came too late. The application was no doubt made without sufficient reflection, and under circumstances of undue excitement; but to persist in the claim, and to complain of its refusal after time has been given for reconsideration, is an absurdity for which we were not prepared.

We are told in the Review, that one of the coloured men said in the conference, "we are aware of our privileges, for when the bishop was in town, HE told us to go to the conference and insist upon our rights, for we had as good a right to vote, as any man in the conference, and if he were in the chair, he would call to order and put down any man who would oppose our right to vote." We are certain, however, that the coloured preacher stated, that the coloured men were not *careful* to insist upon their right to vote, and especi-

ally upon questions in which the characters of white men were involved; and we think also, he added, that in this last particular, they were governed, not only by their own sense of propriety, but also by the advice of a bishop. We have noticed this allusion to a bishop, however, chiefly to do away the impression which has been made by it—namely, that the advice had been given by bishop George, when last in Baltimore, a little before the session of the District Conference, and with reference to the cases which would necessarily come before that body. The advice was given some years ago by another bishop, on application made to him by the coloured preachers, for his opinion as to their privileges in the conference under the discipline—and therefore could not have been intended to bear on circumstances which at that time could not have been foreseen.

The reviewers consider coloured preachers precluded from voting in the conference by the rule of discipline, which provides, that “our coloured preachers and official members shall have all the privileges which are usual to others in the District and Quarterly Meeting Conferences, where the usages of the country do not forbid it.” We cannot concur in this opinion until it be shown, that the laws or usages of this state “forbid” christian communities to confer church privileges on coloured people. The laws of the state certainly do not forbid it, and as to usages, we are not the only church which does so. In fact, when we with other denominations acknowledge coloured men as ministers of the gospel, we have no higher church privileges to confer upon them. Political rights and privileges are quite different matters, with which as a church we have nothing to do. The dissolution of the District Conference has *no connexion* with the right of coloured preachers to vote—the conference was not dissolved by their aid or agency—but under the discipline they were as much entitled to vote as any other members of the conference, and if the exercise of this right, by coloured men, be necessarily fraught with the dreadful consequences alleged by the reviewers—then there existed, according to their own showing, an obvious necessity for dissolving the conference.

The reviewers represent Mr. Chalmers as secretary, pro tem. whereas he was elected by the conference, without opposition, as their secretary. It is not true that a motion was before the house, when the conference was dissolved, “*the motion to elect J. S. Reese secretary, being undisposed of.*” The motion was very properly disposed of, for it never had been received by the conference—the *nominator* and the *nominated* were both suspended preachers. The president appointed Mr. Robb, secretary pro tem. on the first day of the session, and the next morning the conference elected Mr. Chalmers.

Mr. Maybury Parks, who is not *now* a methodist preacher, is brought in to bolster up the pretension of suspended preachers to the right of voting in the conference. It seems, that as there is nothing either in *law* or *propriety* to sustain the right, it is to be helped out by *precedent*. Let us see how Mr. Parks’ certificate will mend the claim.

"CERTIFICATE.

"*Baltimore, Jan. 15th, 1828.*

"This is to certify, that when I appeared at the District Conference as a suspended local preacher, the Rev. S. G. Roszel sent to Mr. Clark's for me to come and take my seat in the conference. My case did not come on until about the middle of the session, until which time I considered myself at liberty to vote on all questions that came before the conference, and no member ever questioned my right to exercise all the privileges of the other members of the conference.

MAYBURY PARKS."

Now mark the studied ambiguity of the certificate. Mr. Parks does not say that *he did vote*, or otherwise participate in the business before the conference during his suspension. He *only* says that he considered himself "at liberty" to do so, and that nobody questioned it. What pitiful shuffling is here. Mr. Parks never made the pretension, whatever his opinions were, and therefore there was no opportunity to question his claims. Had he voted, or attempted to vote, his erroneous impressions with regard to his privileges, would have been very speedily corrected.

But the truth is, had there been no radicalism in the affair, there would have been no pretension on the part of suspended preachers to vote until their suspension was removed. This was clearly admitted by Dr. Jennings, during the debate. He stated expressly, that if the suspensions had been of an ordinary character—for immorality or the like, it would have been "*absurd to make the pretension.*" But it was obvious that the conference could not decide upon the grounds of the suspension, until they were investigated—and this could not be done until the cases came before it for trial. All the conference knew officially, was, that certain members had been suspended, by an inferior church judicatory, and whatever were the grounds of the verdict, the suspended members must stand in the same relation to the conference, as other suspended members did, until a trial could be had and justice could be done. It was therefore *absurd*, according to the doctor's own showing, to make the pretension which he and his associates made before the Baltimore District Conference.

THE SIGNERS OF THE REPLY.

C.

CORRESPONDENCE OF DR. JOHN C. GREEN WITH THE QUARTERLY MEETING CONFERENCE.

The cases of the suspended local preachers, being called up by the Quarterly Meeting Conference, on the 16th January, 1828, the following communication from Dr. John C. Green, of Virginia, with two accompanying letters, were read, viz:

No. 1.

Communication from Dr. Green to the Conference.

Baltimore city, January 16th, 1828.

TO THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE BALTIMORE QUARTERLY
CONFERENCE NOW IN SESSION:

Dear Brethren,—Whereas certain charges have been preferred by members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, against certain local preachers in said church; and whereas those certain preachers have been suspended from their ministerial office by a committee competent to try them; and whereas the trial of those said preachers is now pending before you in your conference capacity; and whereas, I, as a disinterested member of said church, have volunteered as a mediator between the accused and the accusers, as there is a negotiation now pending between Dr. S. K. Jennings and myself, in relation to terms of reconciliation between said parties; and as the said negotiation is now in a way to progress, but has not arrived at that point wherein a full understanding of the terms of said reconciliation can be had; and as such a reconciliation is desirable, and has been sought in time past on your part with anxious vigilance, and would now be hailed by each one of you, as a circumstance portending better days; I therefore propose to you, to suspend your proceedings in reference to those suspended brethren, for twenty-four hours, so that a full understanding may be had, between the said suspended preachers and the church, which the subscriber pledges himself to communicate to the conference, at seven o'clock, P. M. January 17, 1828.

I am, dear brethren, with due respect, yours, &c.

J. C. GREEN.

No. 2.

Letter from Dr. Green to Dr. S. K. Jennings.

At Charles A. Warfield of A.'s, Paca-st.

DR. S. K. JENNINGS:

Baltimore city, 15th Jan. 1828.

Dear Sir,—I have long viewed with feelings of deep regret, the unfortunate schism in our church in this city, and can no longer be an idle spectator of the melancholy scene. I have travelled near one hundred miles to volunteer in the work of mediation between the contending parties.

The pacification of the church of God, the restoration of peace, harmony and good will among the brethren, were the objects had in view, before I left Virginia.

Therefore, your generous feelings will pardon the liberty taken by a stranger, in proposing to you, a negotiation upon that subject.

I assure you, that although my feelings are all excited and alive to the importance of the subject, and notwithstanding my ingenuous, my deep, and unmoveable attachments to the doctrine and discipline, together with the general administration thereof, in the Methodist Episcopal Church, yet my prejudices are not excited; therefore cannot be enlisted against any man who may happen to

differ in opinion with me on these subjects; these are matters too small to scatter the flock of Christ—to destroy the union and communion of brethren, or dissolve the bond of peace, by which they ought to be bound together in time and in eternity.*

I have not mentioned this subject to any of your stationed preachers, and therefore, I am not authorized to make any proposition to you in regard to terms of reconciliation.

I take the whole responsibility of the correspondence upon myself, and feel justified therein, by the high estimation in which I hold ministerial characters in general, and yours in particular.

You have long maintained a zeal for the spread of the gospel, and the prosperity of the church, and sorry indeed should I now be, were you exiled from her bosom, although I never saw you.

In reference therefore to the glory of God, the peace of Zion, and your individual happiness, I ask, is there no possible means, by which we can obtain an amicable adjustment of the existing difference between the children of our common mother? If you cannot give me an explicit answer to this question, which I ask with almost trembling anxiety, I hope you will at least give me some information in relation to your disposition on the subject, and should it be such, as will justify a hope of success in the good work of mediation, be assured I will shrink from no duty, tending to a peaceful result, and then with you, and them, have an equal participation in the glory of the achievement.

I shall defer my correspondence with my brethren on the side of the constituted authorities of the church, until I receive your answer, which I hope you will return by the bearer of this letter, or as soon as convenient.

I am, dear sir, respectfully yours, &c.
(Signed) JOHN C. GREEN.

P. S. I flatter myself with a hope of success in this undertaking, because I know that the members of our church have never had an objection to a full and free discussion relative to doctrines and rights, provided that discussion is conducted with christian calmness and moderation. Personalities and sarcastic allusions, can constitute no part of an argument, and therefore they cannot be essential to the existing controversy. It is then plain, that neither the church nor the reformers, will be under the necessity of surrendering any right, or of sacrificing any principle, in order to a reconciliation. The freedom of speech and the freedom of the press, is as allowable in church as in state. But the substitution of any thing else for argument, amounts to an abandonment of the principles of fair disputation. Therefore, I have no hesitation in believing, that the church will agree to terms of reconciliation, both reasonable and right, and terms to which the reformers might concede consistently with every principle of interest and of honour.

Yours, &c.
(Signed) J. C. G.

* The application of these remarks to *doctrine* is recalled by Dr. Green, as will be seen by a subsequent letter. See No. 5.

No. 3.

Letter from Dr. Jennings to Dr. Green.

REV. JNO. C. GREEN: *Baltimore, North-st. Jan. 16, 1828.*

Dear Sir,—Your favour of the 15th inst. is received, and it affords me much satisfaction, to have an opportunity to reciprocate your kind regard for my personal happiness, and your christian concern for the peace of Zion. As a volunteer in the work of mediation between the contending parties of our church, you have undertaken a service, which I feel pleasure in saying, has rendered you particularly respectable. And, judging from your letter and from what I have learned of your character, perhaps there is no man in the Baltimore Conference who would be more kindly received by us all, in that amiable capacity.

As to the disposition of reformers, on the subject, I can speak as an individual, and say, I was sincere, and I believe my brethren were equally so, when at the first we declared our determination, not to separate from the church. We have continued to reiterate the same purpose, until many of us have been excommunicated. We have still persevered, and suffered all this injury, in consequence of our high estimation of the liberty of speech and of the press. And yet, I am sure, we entertain no wish to “use personalities or sarcastic allusions.” Yet if brethren *improperly* oppose our claim to the right of representation, we cannot think an expose of such improper conduct necessarily constitutes an instance of exceptionable personality. Nor ought our adherence to the principles of liberty, ever to have subjected us to such persecution, even if we had suffered ourselves to be provoked to use too much severity.

You ask, is there no possible means, by which we can obtain an amicable adjustment of the existing difference between the children of our common mother?

The brethren of the opposite party, have treated us with so much injustice, I was beginning to think not; but I gladly admit, that your letter has lighted up a hope. You seem so confident that the members of our church have never had an objection to a full and free discussion, relative to doctrines and rights; and particularly, you appear to be so certain, that “the church will agree to terms of reconciliation, both reasonable and right, and terms to which reformers might concede, consistently with every principle of interest and honour;” that under the hope which you have excited, I take the liberty to say, that I think reformers would willingly be reconciled, if the liberty of speech and of the press, and the interests of the cause of reform, can be honourably protected.

With sentiments of respect and brotherly love,

I am yours,

SAM'L K. JENNINGS.

P. S. I presume it has already occurred to you, that in order to act as a mediator between the two contending parties, your manner of intercourse should be the same in relation to both; as any approach towards the one side which is not equally tendered towards the other, might procure your identification with the party favour-

ed, although it might in reality be no more than the appearance of partiality. And it would be much to be regretted, that there should be any avoidable difficulty to prevent the accomplishment of the laudable object of your visit to our city.

Thereupon the conference passed the following resolution:

“*Resolved*, That this conference suspend its proceedings, in reference to the suspended preachers, until to-morrow evening, and when it adjourns, it adjourn until half past 6 o'clock to-morrow evening.”

17th January, 1828, the conference met according to adjournment. The secretary laid before the conference the following communication and accompanying documents, from Dr. Green, viz.

No. 4.

Communication from Dr. Green to the Conference.

Baltimore, January 17th, 1828.

TO THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE QUARTERLY CONFERENCE
NOW IN SESSION:

Dear Brethren,—In the progress of the correspondence relative to an adjustment of the differences in our church, I have seen the necessity of making to you a proposition in relation to the manner of conducting the negociation. It is this:—That the Quarterly Conference shall this evening appoint a committee of five of their members, who shall conduct that negociation on the part of the church; and I will this evening desire the Union Society to appoint a committee of five, to conduct the negociation on their part; and that I will stand equally pledged to both, to be a medium of communication between them, until such other and further arrangements shall be made by the parties as will best tend to the promotion of the grand object. I will take the liberty of recommending to both parties, the appointment of men of calmness and deliberation.

As a matter of convenience to myself, being far from home and anxious to return, I will also propose, that there shall be a mutual exchange of propositions, either through myself or any other person that may be appointed as a medium of communication, (or else in a conference of the two committees, but these matters can be regulated,) by 12 o'clock to-morrow.

I have taken the liberty of submitting to the consideration of the Quarterly Conference, the propositions which I have transmitted to the Union Society.

This is a period pregnant with events, and events too that involve the destinies, not only of the present, but also of the future and unborn generations. May a gracious Providence give us wisdom to act with due reference to both.

I am, dear brethren, with sincere regard, yours, &c.

JOHN C. GREEN.

No. 5.

Letter from Dr. Green to Dr. Jennings.

At Mr. Charles A. Warfield of A's,
Baltimore, Jan. 16, 1828.

DR. S. K. JENNINGS:

Reverend and dear Sir,—Your letter of this day is now before me, and permit me to say, that it has afforded me great pleasure. The temper of your letter is in perfect accordance with the spirit of christianity. To the want of this principle, must be attributed the many failures in attempting the adjustment of differences among men, really honest, and even anxious to accomplish so desirable an end. That the adjustment of the differences alluded to is desirable, is evident from a consideration of the endless consequences that may result from them.

After the busy multitudes now immediately concerned in the controversy—the tongues that plead for rights, or complain of injuries—the public eye that watches with vigilance their hurried movements, and the hand that writes these lines of mediation, shall all be laid in the grave, the consequences of the existing divisions may roll on through time, and be as endless as eternity itself. With this view of the subject, and under the impression of this truth, permit me again to assure you of my anxiety for you all as brethren—as the members of Christ's mystical body, to meet each other around the altar of the church, at the foot of the cross, and there mingle the feelings of reciprocal love, shake the friendly hand, exchange the glances of charity's eye, and say, as Christ loved the church and gave himself for it, so we, in imitation of his example, will sacrifice every selfish consideration at the shrine of his religion. After the above preliminary observations, and after assuring you again, that I still have no authority from preachers or people to make any propositions to you, I will proceed to the consideration of such, as to me seem a proper ground of adjustment. It cannot reasonably be expected, that there should be a perfect identity of opinion on such a subject, because different men see through different optics; but as I said in my letter to you yesterday, a difference of opinion, in relation to ecclesiastical legislation and the administration of discipline, are matters too small to scatter the flock of Christ.

The application I made of this remark to doctrine, I beg leave to recall, for it was made inadvertently, owing to an anxiety about the success of my mission.

The understanding I have of the difficulties existing among the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in this city, is as follows, viz. The accusers charge the accused, with speaking evil of ministers, and of endeavouring to sow dissensions in the church of God. That this has been done through the medium of the Mutual Rights. They therefore consider the relation they sustain to the church as making it their imperious and indispensable duty to proceed against those who publish it, by themselves or by their agents. And, if I understand the views of the reformers, they think they have certain rights, which originate in their relation to the church,

not protected and guaranteed by the existing regulations of said church—that they are justifiable in contending for those privileges and advantages to which they have a right. You say, “yet if brethren improperly oppose our right of representation, we cannot think an expose of such improper conduct necessarily constitutes an instance of exceptionable personality.”

Now suppose the reformers have the right of representation, and yet their brethren think differently, may they not both be equally sincere? But suppose further, that the latter admitted the claim of the former, but thought that the exercise of that right not essential to the happiness of the claimants—not practicable nor expedient in the church, might they not still be sincere?

Again, cannot the principle of reform—the right of representation, be freely discussed and fully canvassed, without reference to characters and motives? Whenever characters and motives are impeached and assailed on one side, a retributive re-action is produced, which results in an assailment of characters and motives on the other. Such a case may be properly represented, by two combatants on the field, for however signal a victory one may gain over the other, they will both be so much battered and bruised that they will be losers and not gainers by the contest. Such a course of reciprocal impeachment must inevitably result in reciprocal injury, for it cannot fail to lower the standard of ministerial dignity, by destroying public confidence in those to whom God has committed a dispensation of the gospel. We can readily see how this gospel can be the power of God to the salvation of such as believe, but we cannot conceive how it can be such to those who do not even believe in the moral integrity of them that preach it.

If such an unfortunate course should be adopted and persisted in, ministers of the gospel may look to the tigers of the woods, and not to the lambs of the field, for emblematical representations of their sacred functions.

I need not say any more on this melancholy subject, for you must anticipate me, you must concur with me.

Suffer me now to give you my opinion. I think your claim to the right of representation is fully asserted, is fully before the church, and fully before the world, and together with all that laboured argumentation by which it is to be sustained; therefore, the necessity for the continuance of the Mutual Rights has ceased, at least for the present.

Also, your memorial to the General Conference is prepared, and you yourselves, I suppose, intended to await the result, why not then suspend the Mutual Rights, at least until the result shall be known. But if you deem the continuance of that publication necessary to the maintenance of your cause, I propose that there shall be a change in the manner of conducting it, and that by this change, it shall be made in fact, what it now is in title, “Mutual Rights.” My proposition is this:—That in future, it shall be conducted by a committee, in whose appointment the friends of the present administration, and the friends of reform, shall have an equal part. And then, in order to the publication of any essay or letter therein, the

consent of a majority of the said committee shall be indispensably necessary. That every essay or letter therein published, shall bear the true and proper signature of its author, or if the proper signature of the author is not given, the consent of two-thirds of the said committee shall be necessary in order to its publication. That it shall be the common vehicle of argument on both sides of the question. This arrangement will afford to all the same facility of communication, and allow the same freedom of speech, the same freedom of the press. In doing this, the reformers will surrender no right, they will sacrifice no principle. They will only allow their brethren to have with them an equal participation in the same privileges, and consequently, it will be consistent with the pure principle of mutual rights and the most dignified sense of honour. For the truth of this proposition, I appeal to the soundness of your judgment and the honesty of your heart. As to the right of property, that ought of course to continue where it is.

I propose, secondly, that the Union Society shall be dissolved until the result of your memorial to the General Conference shall be known. My reason for making this proposition is this—I understand the principal object of the Union Society was, to procure unanimity among the reformers in their memorial to the General Conference, and as this object was accomplished at your late convention, the necessity for its existence has of course ceased. Also, this society, while it continues to exist, must necessarily place a line of separation between the members of the same church. I think it necessary to the existence of unanimity in said church, that that line should be obliterated. And accordingly, upon the acceptance of the above propositions, or such a modification of them as shall be agreed upon, on the part of the brethren who are suspended and those who are expelled, I shall expect of the church, that the charges against the local preachers shall be dismissed, and that the lay-members shall, on an appeal, be restored to membership.

I make these propositions to you, as the representative of all the reformers of this city, Mr. Alexander McCaine excepted. I mean, they are intended for their benefit, though I have corresponded with none but yourself. As to Mr. McCaine, I think his conduct can only be atoned for by deep penitence and honest confession. I can now assure you, I am both honest and earnest in this business. I am under the influence of no man. If all the men in Baltimore were to unite in one combination, they could not induce me to take any course which my judgment did not approve. I gave you a faithful transcript of my motives and feelings yesterday, but I can give you no assurance of the soundness of my judgment in relation to the justness of the above propositions. On those subjects you must exercise your own better judgment. May God direct you in the determination.

I assure you again, that I am still acting on my own individual responsibility. I have no assurance that the church will accede to the above terms; I only give it as my opinion, that she ought to accede to them, and that she will accede to them.

I set out from my family and my home, with the intention to volunteer as a mediator in this case, without being solicited to do so by any one, and should God in his wisdom and goodness make me successful, I shall not rejoice alone. Hundreds of my brethren will rejoice with me! Yea, there will be joy among the angels in heaven.

Notwithstanding it has been said, that all men were fluent when speaking of themselves, but none were pleasant, yet you will pardon me for adverting to myself and my own case on the present occasion. Under circumstances of peculiar provocation, I withdrew from the Methodist Church, and remained in a state of exile from her altars, two years, and was then compelled by a sense of duty and my spiritual interests, to seek an asylum, within her sanctuary again. She still flourished, while I, like an exterminated plant, withered. I was soon admonished by experience, that the children of the Methodist Church could not well live in a state of separation from their mother. With due christian love to other christian denominations, and under a thorough persuasion, that there are true christians in each one of them, yet to methodist children the Methodist Church alone yields the sincere milk of the word.

The recollection of that precipitate determination of my agitated mind—that mournful circumstance, and a full conviction of the truth of the above remark, has planted deep in my breast a concern—a sympathy for such as may be about to follow my unfortunate example. If a man can reconcile it to his conscience to abandon religion, he may easily abandon the church, but while he retains his religion, the church alone can be his contented home.

You will have the goodness to lay these propositions before the suspended and expelled brethren, and then let me know the result of their deliberations. It will be necessary that I should receive some information on the subject before to-morrow night, as the conference, in consequence of this negociation, has postponed its proceedings in the case of the suspended brethren, until that time. That is, until half past 6 o'clock to-morrow night.

In reply to your P. S. I have only to say, that I have not a single acquaintance among the reformers in this city, and therefore hope it will not be expected of me to visit those whom I know not, and who have no knowledge of me. When the way shall be opened for a friendly intercourse with them, I shall be free to embrace the opportunity.

I am, dear sir, your obedient humble servant,

JOHN C. GREEN.

No. 6.

Reply from Dr. Jennings to Dr. Green.

REV. JOHN C. GREEN: *Baltimore, North-st. Jan. 17th, 1828.*

Reverend and dear Sir,—I have no right to claim the important character, of being the “representative” of the reformers in the city of Baltimore, much less of all the reformers throughout the United States, who are as deeply interested, as any of us here. I therefore, have no authority to do more, than to inform the president of the Union Society, that you are here, and desirous to bring about

a reconciliation of the contending parties, in the Methodist Episcopal Church. This I have done, and he has called a meeting of the society accordingly, this evening at half past five o'clock.

As soon as convenient, you will receive a communication, officially, from that body.

Accept the assurances of my respect and brotherly love,
SAMUEL K. JENNINGS.

P. S. I am sorry to be obliged to say, that the time you have specified, looks too much like being in a hurry, considering the great importance of the subject.

S. K. J.

No. 7.

Letter from Dr. Green to Dr. Jennings.

*At Mr. Charles A. Warfield of A.'s,
Baltimore city, Jan. 17, 1828.*

DR. S. K. JENNINGS:

Reverend and dear Sir,—On the reception of your favour of this day, I saw the necessity of making one other proposition to you, not in relation to the terms of the pending negociation, but in relation to the manner of conducting it.

It is this—that the Union Society shall this evening appoint a committee of five of your members, who shall conduct that negociation on the part of the whole association in this city: and I will this evening solicit the Quarterly Conference to appoint a committee of five, to conduct the negociation on the part of the church: and that I will stand equally pledged to both, to be a medium of communication between them, until such other and further arrangements shall be made by the parties as will best tend to the promotion of the grand object. I will take the liberty of recommending to both parties, the appointment of men of calmness and deliberation. As a matter of convenience to myself, being far from home and anxious to return, I would also propose, that there shall be a mutual exchange of propositions, either through myself or any other person, that may be appointed as a medium of communication, (or else in a conference of the two committees;) but these matters can be regulated by twelve o'clock to-morrow.

I will take the liberty of submitting to the consideration of the Quarterly Conference, the propositions in your possession, and which you will have the goodness to lay before the Union Society for their consideration.

This is a period pregnant with events, and events too that involve the destinies, not only of the present but also of the future and unborn generations. May a gracious providence give us wisdom to act with due reference to both.

In haste, I am, dear sir, with sincere regard,

Your obedient humble servant,

JOHN C. GREEN.

Whereupon, Dr. T. E. Bond offered the following resolutions, which were seconded by brother George Earnest, and adopted, viz:

‘Resolved, That the conference perceive no good reason for taking the management of the negociation, which Dr. Green has under-

taken, out of his hands, and therefore decline the appointment of any committee in the case.

“*Resolved*, That the conference when it does adjourn, will adjourn to meet to-morrow evening, at half past six o’clock, to hear what Dr. Green has been able to accomplish in reference to his other propositions.”

On the evening of the 18th, the following communication, and accompanying documents, were received by the conference from Dr. Green, viz:

No. 8.

Communication from Dr. Green.

*At Mr. Charles A. Warfield of A.’s,
Baltimore city, Jan. 18, 1828.*

TO THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE QUARTERLY CONFERENCE
IN THE BALTIMORE CITY STATION, NOW IN SESSION:

Dear Brethren,—I have received information that a meeting was held last night by the Union Society of this city, and that they appointed a committee to negotiate on their part, with the constituted authorities of the church. This negotiation, therefore, cannot be carried on in the manner contemplated by the Union Society, unless their committee can consider me as an authorized mediator by some resolution of the conference.

I have herewith sent to the conference, a copy of my communication to that committee, having previously furnished them with the resolutions of the conference last night, relative to the pending negotiation.

I hope that a sense of the importance of this subject, whether considered in relation to the church, the reformers, or the world, will excite the deepest feelings of interest in every member of the conference; and that you will take such a course as will tend to the restoration of your suspended brethren, and the general pacification of the church. I have received information, but not officially, that the committee immediately on the reception of my communication of to-day, went into consultation; but it is probable that the shortness of the time, and the importance of the subject, rendered it impracticable for them to give me an answer this evening.*

I am, dear brethren, your obedient humble servant,

JOHN C. GREEN.

No. 9.

Letter from Mr. John Chappell, Chairman, &c. to Dr. Green.

North street, Baltimore, Jan. 18th, 1828.

Reverend Sir,—At a meeting of the Union Society of Baltimore, convened last evening, agreeably to your request, John Chappell, Samuel K. Jennings, Luther J. Cox, John J. Harrod and Beal Israel, were appointed a committee, to negotiate with a similar committee, appointed by the Quarterly Meeting Conference of the Bal-

* Dr. Green subsequently, on the evening of the 18th, received the communication marked No. 11, from Mr. Chappell, which was submitted to the conference.

timore city station, (through your mediation) the conditions of reconciliation between the reformers and the constituted authorities of the Methodist Episcopal Church. By this, therefore, you will be informed, that on our part, we are ready to enter upon the negotiation accordingly.

JOHN CHAPPELL,
Chairman of Committee.

P. S. Any notice left at John J. Harrod's, No. 172 Market street, will receive early attention.

No. 10.

Letter from Dr. Green to Mr. John Chappell, Chairman, &c.

*At Charles A. Warfield of A.'s, Paca-st.
Baltimore city, Jan. 18th. 1828.*

Dear Brother,—I received your official communication, announcing the appointment of a committee to negotiate on the part of the Union Society of this city, with the constituted authorities of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Annexed you have the Resolutions [inserted above] passed in the Conference of January 17th, 1828, relative to the suspension of proceedings in reference to the suspended Local Preachers.

The Conference having thought proper to leave the prosecution of the negotiation with me, I shall wait to hear from the committee in reference to the original propositions made to Dr. Jennings in my communication.

It will be necessary that the committee, should be explicit in the expression of their views of those propositions, and furnish me with the result of their deliberations, in time to enable me to make a further communication to the Quarterly Conference, at their adjourned session this evening. If the propositions alluded to should be accepted as the basis of the negotiation, I have no doubt but the Conference will give further time for the perfecting and adjustment so much to be desired.

By the adjournment of the conference, and the suspension of proceedings in reference to the suspended Local Preachers, a disposition is evinced on the part of that body, favourable to the contemplated reconciliation.

I am, dear sir, yours, very respectfully,

JOHN C. GREEN.

*To Mr. John Chappell, chairman of the committee
appointed by the Union Society of Baltimore.*

No. 11.

Letter from Mr. John Chappell, Chairman, &c. to Dr. Green.

North street, 18th January, 1828.

DR. J. C. GREEN:

Reverend Sir,—Yours of to-day is received. At your instance, the Union Society met last evening, and appointed us a committee, to negotiate through you, with a similar committee, from the Quar-

terly meeting Conference of the Baltimore city station, terms preparatory to a reconciliation with the contending parties in the Methodist Episcopal Church in said station. The Quarterly meeting Conference having "declined the appointment of any committee in the case," according to their resolution, and our powers being limited to a negotiation with such a committee through you, as a mediator; you will perceive that an essential part of the arrangements, contemplated by our appointment is still wanting, and without which, we are not empowered to proceed further.

Yours, very respectfully,

JOHN CHAPPELL, *Chairman.*

After reading of which communication and documents, Dr. T. E. Bond offered the following resolution, which was seconded by brother George Earnest, and adopted, viz:

"Whereas, from the communication made by Doctor Green to the conference this evening, it appears that he has not been able to bring his negotiation to any definite conclusion, and whereas, this conference wish to afford every facility to the accomplishment of his laudable undertaking, therefore,

"*Resolved*, That the conference will adjourn until Monday evening next at 6 o'clock P. M. in order to afford time for further efforts—and that they will duly consider any communications, which may be offered to the conference through him, by those in whose favour he has offered his friendly mediation."

The conference met according to adjournment, on Monday evening 21st January, 1828, when the following communication, and accompanying documents, were received from Dr. Green, and read, viz:

No. 12.

Communication from Dr. Green to the Conference.

Baltimore, January 21st, 1828.

TO THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE QUARTERLY CONFERENCE
OF THE BALTIMORE CITY STATION, NOW IN SESSION:

Dear Brethren,—It is my duty to inform you, that the correspondence in which you, by your official acts, indulged me, with a view to reclaim the suspended and expelled brethren of this city, is now closed.

I have forwarded to you that part of the correspondence, which has been had, since your last adjournment.

The restoration of those brethren to the church, was my primary object, but in this I have failed.

God knows how to appreciate my motives in this transaction, and I hope you and they know how to appreciate them also.

I tender you my grateful acknowledgments, for the respect you have shown me, who was but a stranger to almost all of your body, and, for that lenity, and even good will towards your suspended brethren, manifested, both by your expressions and your acts.

I leave those brethren as I found them. May God superintend your administration— direct your hearts into his love, and conduct you to his kingdom, is the sincere wish and prayer of

Your obedient humble servant,

JOHN C. GREEN.

No. 13.

Letter from Dr. Green to Mr. John Chappell, Chairman, &c.

At Mr. Charles A. Warfield of A.'s, Paca-st.

Baltimore city, Jan. 19, 1828.

Dear Brother,—Your second communication of yesterday has been received, and I have taken the liberty of submitting it to the consideration of the Quarterly Conference, in order to procure a further suspension of its proceedings, in relation to the suspended local preachers.

By this act, I hope I have given a further demonstration of the earnestness of my purpose, and the sincerity of my pretensions. I lament the inability of the conference to yield to my solicitation, in the appointment of a committee, to correspond with the committee appointed by the Union Society, to conduct the friendly negotiation, proposed by myself, between the church and the reformers.

But while I lament its inability, I can but applaud those dispositions it has manifested toward the accused brethren, both by its words and its acts.

If the constituted authorities, under which it acts in its conference capacity, could by any construction, be made to legalize the appointment of a committee, it would not have hesitated to have made such an appointment, for both duty and inclination would have urged it thereto.

But the act of the conference last night, has fully obviated the difficulty felt by you and myself, and which difficulty was fully stated to the conference by me, in a letter written before I had received yours on that subject. I am now fully authorised by the annexed resolution, to receive from you the result of your deliberations, in relation to the terms I proposed to the Rev. Dr. Jennings. And further, the conference has, by that resolution, given the fullest assurance that it will duly consider any communication that may be made to it by the committee of the Union Society, through me their constituted medium.

The propositions to which I refer, were as follows: That in future, the Mutual Rights shall be conducted by a committee, in whose appointment the friends of the present administration, and the friends of reform, shall have an equal part. And then, in order to the publication of an essay or letter therein, the consent of a majority of the said committee shall be indispensably necessary.

That every essay or letter therein published, shall bear the true and proper signature of its author. Or, if the proper signature of its author is not given, the consent of two-thirds of the said committee shall be necessary in order to its publication. And that it shall be the common vehicle of argument on both sides of the question. This arrangement will afford to all the same facility of com-

munication, and allow the same freedom of speech—the same freedom of the press.

In doing this, the reformers will surrender no ecclesiastical right—they will sacrifice no principle. They will only allow their brethren to have with them, an equal participation in the same privileges, and consequently, it will be consistent with the pure principle of mutual rights, and the most dignified sense of honour. As to the right of property in the periodical called *Mutual Rights*, that ought of course to continue where it is.

I propose, secondly, that the Union Society shall be dissolved, until the result of the memorial of the General Convention of reformers to the General Conference shall be known. My reason for making this proposition, is this—I understand the principal object of the Union Society was to procure unanimity in their memorial to the General Conference, and as this object was accomplished at their late convention, the necessity for its existence has of course ceased. Also this society, while it continues to exist, must necessarily place a line of separation between the members of the same church; I think it necessary therefore, to the existence of union in said church, that, that line should be obliterated. Upon the acceptance of the above propositions, or such a modification of them as shall be agreed upon on the part of the brethren who are suspended, and of those who are expelled, I shall expect of the church, that the charges against the local preachers shall be dismissed, and the lay members shall, on an appeal, be restored to membership. As the charges on which the local preachers are now suspended, and on which the laymen have been expelled, were “the speaking evil of ministers, and endeavouring to sow dissensions in the church, by enveighing against the discipline,” and this is alleged to have been done by the members of the Union Society in Baltimore, through an editorial committee elected by them, and acting as their agents, who have inserted improper and abusive publications, in the periodical called the *Mutual Rights*, which is published under the direction of the said committee. I deem the dissolution of the Union Society, and the salutary check on the future publications which may appear in the *Mutual Rights*, as conditions upon which, both the suspended preachers, and expelled brethren, may be restored to the confidence and fellowship of the church. It will be seen, that these conditions are not applicable to Mr. McCaine, as there is a charge against him, of a different and particular nature, and therefore he is not included in my proposals.

As I shall be under the imperious necessity of leaving this city at the furthest on next Tuesday morning, and as it is necessary to come to some definite understanding, at least on the preliminary arrangements, I wish to be distinctly informed, whether you can accept the above proposals as the basis of a compromise.

I am, dear sir, yours affectionately,

JOHN C. GREEN.

*To Mr. John Chappell, chairman of
the committee of the Union Society.*

No. 14.

Reply from Mr. John Chappell, Chairman, &c.

Baltimore, January 19, 1828.

Reverend Sir,—Your communication of this morning is received, and in accordance with the direction of the Union Society, herewith enclose a copy of a resolution of said society; which you perceive precludes me “from further correspondence upon the subject;” unless on the receipt of a “communication,” from the constituted “authorities” of “the” Methodist Episcopal “Church.”

With much respect, yours,

JOHN CHAPPELL, *President*
of the *Baltimore Union Society.*

REV. DR. JOHN C. GREEN.

Extract—Minutes of Union Society, January 18th, 1828.

Resolved, That the President be, and hereby is, directed if any further communication should be received from Dr. Green, upon the subject of the reconciliation proposed by him, to write to Dr. Green, informing him, that inasmuch as the Quarterly meeting Conference have not appointed a committee to confer with our committee, we must for the present, decline any further correspondence upon the subject. At the same time, informing Doctor Green, that we shall at all times be ready to receive any communication, on the part of the authorities of the church, towards a reconciliation.

LEVI R. REESE,

Secretary Union Society.

No. 15.

Letter from Dr. Green, to Mr. John Chappell, President, &c.

Baltimore, January 21st, 1828.

TO MR. JOHN CHAPPELL, PRESIDENT OF THE BALTIMORE UNION SOCIETY.

(Care of Mr. John J. Harrod, No. 172 Market street.)

Dear Brother,—Your letter of the 19th inst. is received, and I exceedingly regret the precipitate resolution of the Union Society, by which it has placed an immovable obstacle in the way of further correspondence, relative to the contemplated compromise.

It is not within my province to judge of the innocence or guilt of the suspended or expelled brethren, nor of the justice or injustice of the prosecution; but I am prepared to say, that if the Union Society had taken my propositions under consideration, and reported its willingness to make them the basis of a compromise, there would have been no further difficulty.

I did not propose them as a *sine qua non*, but as the basis; and even asked for such a modification of them, as might be agreed upon.

In prospect of an amicable adjustment through my mediation, the conference not only recognised me in that character, but adjourned

from day to day, in order to give time for calm and rational deliberation, on the part of the suspended and expelled members—and also to afford every facility to the pending negotiation.

If the conference, as a church judicatory, could have felt itself authorised to appoint a committee without seeming to prejudicate the cases of the accused members, and to demand satisfaction of those, whom it had not condemned, or even tried, they would, I believe have done so. I believe this, because these were the objections made before the conference, by those who opposed the measure, and have been reiterated to me by several members of the conference, since that time.

The same propositions were submitted to the consideration of the Union Society, and of the Quarterly Conference, and various members of the latter body, have assured me of their individual willingness to accede to the terms proposed; but I have received no such assurance from the suspended or expelled members. Even at this stage of the business, were those brethren to signify their willingness to accede to the terms proposed, I entertain no doubt of a willingness on the part of the church, to accede to them; therefore I still hope, that those brethren, on further reflection will do so, before the conference shall have convened again; and if the conference and the church does not receive those brethren to its bosom and its privileges, they shall have my sympathies, and the church my censure.

The propositions I believe, are not only just, but even generous to the suspended and expelled brethren; but their justness must be judged of, at another *and a higher tribunal*.

I have made all my communications in writing, and both the church, and the reformers, have an equal right to a full understanding of my proceedings; therefore, the secretary of the conference, is authorised to furnish the suspended and expelled brethren, with a copy of all my correspondence on this subject.

On the reception of Doctor Jennings' second letter, my fears were all excited as to the catastrophe of this correspondence.

The intimation he made, of an existing relation between the suspended and expelled brethren here, and the reformers throughout the United States, cast a gloom over all my fond anticipations.

The thought had never entered my mind, that the suspended and expelled brethren, sustained to the Union Society an indissoluble relation.

The charges were for acts that could only have been done, by members of the Union Society of Baltimore, namely, improper publications in the Mutual Rights, in which the reformers elsewhere, could not have participated, inasmuch as they could not have participated in the election of the editorial committee.

I must now bid you and them farewell, assuring you at the same time, that I feel an anxious solicitude for the happiness of both yourselves and them. It would have afforded me much pleasure to have had a personal interview with Doctor Jennings on this subject.

I am dear sir, yours sincerely,

(True copy.)

JOHN C. GREEN.

And thereupon the following resolutions were offered by brother Robert Armstrong, seconded by brother G. Earnest, and adopted, viz.

“Whereas, from the communications made to this conference by Dr. Green, it appears that his negotiation with the suspended local preachers has terminated; therefore,

“*Resolved*, That the conference, by three several adjournments, made at the request of Dr. Green, in order to afford time for the effecting the purpose of his mediation, and by a resolution pledging the conference to duly consider any communications which might be made by him in reference to that object, did intend to evince their desire that the accused might be afforded every opportunity to place their cases before the conference in the most favourable point of view.

“*Resolved*, secondly, That this conference could not have appointed a committee to demand terms or conditions of the suspended preachers, without prejudging their cases, as they could not demand satisfaction to the church from those who had not been tried, and consequently had not been convicted by the conference of any offence. Much less could the conference demand any terms of the Union Society, by whom the committee on the part of the accused had been appointed, as most of the members of that society had not been brought before the conference on any charge whatever.

Resolved, thirdly, That as from the communications on the table, there does not appear to be any reason or application for further delay—therefore the conference will now proceed to take up the cases of the suspended preachers.”

The cases were taken up accordingly, and after the conference had disposed of the same, as heretofore stated in the foregoing narrative, (except the case of the Rev. A. McCaine,) the following resolution was passed on the evening of the 22d January, 1828, viz.

“*Resolved*, That the secretary be directed to furnish the local preachers respectively, with a copy of the decision of this conference in their cases; and also, inform them respectively, that the conference has adjourned until Friday next, at half past 6 o'clock, P. M., when it is probable the conference will adjourn *sine die*.”

At the subsequent meeting of the conference, the secretary reported that, he had complied with the requisition contained in the above resolution; but no communication from any of them, in reference to the conditions annexed to the decision of the conference in their cases, had been received. They were consequently expelled.



Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: May 2006

Preservation Technologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111



WERT
BOOKBINDING
Grantville, Pa.
Sept.—Oct. 1987
We're Quality Bound

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 017 666 526 9